

THE
SADDUCEE

Detected and Refuted,

In REMARKS on the

WORKS

OF

RICHARD COPPIN.

BY

JAMES RELLY. *K*

*For the Sadducees say, That there is no Resurrection, neither
Angel, nor Spirit. ACTS xxiii. 8.*



L O N D O N :

Printed by M. LEWIS, at the Bible and Dove, in Paternoster-
Row. 1764.

[Price One-Shilling.]

THE
SANDUCHE

Deceased and Heir

In the year of the

W O R K S

RIGHTS RESERVED



JAMES

THough I greatly dislike the sentiments of *Richard Coppin*, yet their obsoleteness would have effectually secured them from my attacks: had they not been now re-published and sold, as it were under my nose; many of my hearers, being subscribers to the re-printing of them. From which circumstance, it being quite natural for the public to suppose that our doctrines are congenial; I thought it right to undeceive them: by giving them, in all these particulars, a specimen of my sentiments; which must necessarily be the sentiments of all such, who understand, and believe the doctrines which I preach. Unto this, with the desire of some friends, the following Remarks owe their existence: much rather than to any sanguine expectations by me entertained; of convincing such (of their error) who have already turned aside. For, where there is no heart for the authority of scripture, nor an ear to receive the arguments of reason, it is in vain for man to attempt the conviction and instruction of his brother: as objects of pity, all such must be left to the wisdom,

dom, power, and goodness of him that made them: and who only can convince them of their error.

As I am rather confident of my matter, than of my manner, I hope the candid reader will pass over all faults of the latter, and attend particularly to the former, honouring it with their credit, as far as it consists with the scriptures and right reason.



T H E
S A D D U C E E

Detected and Refuted, &c.

My Dear FRIENDS,

CONTROVERSY is not my element: yet, if (in the smallest degree) it will contribute to your pleasure, and satisfaction, for me to cast my mite into the treasury, I shall readily comply with your desire.

You desire me to give you, and the public, my opinion of *Coppin's* works; as they are now re-publishing.

That I might be able to do this sincerely and impartially, I applied myself with the utmost care, and candor, to the reading of them.—I read three numbers of a work, intitled, *Michael's opposing the dragon*, &c. and also another book by the same author, intitled, *The advancement of all things in Christ, and of Christ in all things*: prefaced with a warm recommendation by Mr. Cayley.

A 3

Having

Having thus far qualified myself to give you an answer *, I shall first tell you, as a matter not at all foreign to your enquiry, that I was not in the least degree accessary, no, nor so much as privy, to the present re-publication of *Coppin's* works, or to any part thereof.

As to the author, I think him unnecessarily abstruse: He labours to cloath himself with darkness as with a garment, and carefully avoids speaking intelligibly, except when he rails at his antagonists: and then he uses great plainness of speech. But, to darken counsel, with words without knowledge, is the grand arcanum of mysticism: and by some, reckoned to be the infallible criterion of spiritual teachings: witness Mr. *Cayley's* preface, to part of this author's works.

Again, instead of submitting, when pinched by argument, or manifestly opposed by truth, he is very evasive: and often begs the question, that he may have an opportunity of bespattering his adversary, and of giving his own system an air of plausibility.

One instance of this, I shall give you, out of the many that may be gathered from his works, No. 3. chap. 12. of *Michael opposing the dragon*. Where, (because his opponents argue for the resurrection of the same body) he insinuates that they plead for the resurrection of a sinful body: whereas there was nothing farther from their thoughts: and this he very well knew.

If

* It was supposed by many, and even affirmed by some, that I privately encouraged the re-publication of *Coppin's* works. Which accounts for my manner of speaking above.

If I affirm, that the same body that died, and was buried, shall rise again : doth it follow from thence, that it must rise a sinful body ? I must deny it, except *Coppin* had proved, or, that his admirers will yet prove, that sin is a property, or part of the body, and essential to its existence—And that would be just the same as to say, that a leprosy, a fever, a delirium, being disorders in the body, are a part thereof ; and that the body cannot exist without them.

Again, I think him opinionated, and conceited, even to silliness : as appears from his boastings of light, knowledge, purity, &c. above his fellows ; though there is not the least spark of this pre-eminence discoverable : neither in his spirit, nor manner.

As to that infallibility which he pretends to, in all his silly, unscriptural determinations ; I believe every man of sense, will attribute it to pride and ignorance. Though he affects to treat his opponents in a very supercilious manner, yet he cannot help discovering, that their accusations give him smart. He betrays a much greater fondness for himself, than becomes an apostle : by complaining of his persecutions, &c. But I shall now leave the author, and take notice of his doctrines.

In his book, intituled, *The advancement of all things in Christ* ; (the same which Mr. *Cayley* hath authorized, and blessed with the highest encomiums) he begins with this hypothesis : That there are two principles, or qualities, in man ; which he calls good, and evil : and that these principles are the elect, and reprobate ; the believer, and unbeliever ; the saved, and

the damned; the *Jacob* and *Esau*; the *Christ*, &c. in every man. And, that the Persons of mankind are not at all concerned in any of those characters. For saith he, "God hates
 " no man's person, but the evil in the person:
 " neither doth he love any man's person any
 " farther than as they shew forth something of
 " himself."

This is not only unsupported by scripture, and common sense; but diametrically opposite to both. Doth the word of truth ever affirm, or even suppose, that there is any good in man? did the prophets, our Saviour, or his apostles, ever bear such a testimony? Is it not their constant language, that the imaginations of man's heart are evil, and that continually? that there is none, who doth good, no not one? that we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags? that there is none good but one, even God? and that all the deeds of this world are evil? that in our flesh (or person) there dwells no good thing?

And as to the supposition of the principles of good, and evil, residing in man; the same word of truth enquires, *What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness, what concord hath Christ with Belial, or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?*

If these cannot dwell together in the same house, much less can they dwell together in the same heart; in the same person. Our Saviour tells us, that the same person cannot serve two masters, *i. e.* God and mammon. The apostle saith, that the same fountain cannot send forth
 bitter

bitter waters and sweet. Thus the scriptures detest, and explode, the notion of those principles being in man.

For, if the same person be an habitation in common; for God and the Devil, for *Christ* and *Belial*, for light and darkness; then would the apostles be found false witnesses: the same fountain would then send forth bitter waters and sweet: *Christ* and *Belial* would then have concord: and the believer would have part with an infidel.

Again, it is contrary to experience, to suppose the being of those two principles in man. The prophets, and apostles, all confessed, that they were sinners; and that there dwelt no good thing in them. Their good consisted wholly in that which dwelt in *Christ*: in what he was made of God unto them—and which was revealed in them by the Spirit of truth.

Every christian, in every age, who have truly known themselves; *have* confessed, and *do* confess, that according to the propensities of their own hearts, they are carnal and sold under sin: and that in them, in their flesh, or in their own persons; there dwelleth no good thing.

That all men are sinners, their actions, spirit, and manner, fully prove: We judge of this, according to what we are taught, to conceive of the nature, and properties, of the divine Being: and, if we are to judge by this rule, it is obvious even to common sense, that there is none that doth good, no not one.

The supposed good, in man; is quite invisible: If you believe it, you must believe it unseen: you must take their word, for what they,

they, to a judicious eye, to an unbiassed judgment, can never make appear. So that if God loves no man, but in proportion to the good that is in him, we may look upon the eternal ruin of every creature as inevitable.

This antichristian invention, owes its original to that spirit, which attempts to investigate truth by the fluctuating passions: by frames, and visions, rather than by the testimony of the prophets and apostles.

The self-righteous spirit was also deeply concerned in the scheme: when fondly dreaming of goodness, and holiness, in the creature; and at the same time convinced of the evil, by scripture and experience; there remained no other way of solving the difficulty, but by proposing that there are two principles in man: or two distinct qualities, *i. e.* good, and evil.

Nor has opposition to the true *Christ* been wanting here. As appears from its ascribing to this phantasm in man; the whole of the salvation, and characters of the Lord *Jesus*: which I shall have occasion to shew, more particularly, in my following remarks.

Having denied, that the persons of mankind are either the objects of God's love, or hatred; that they are either the subjects of salvation, or condemnation, he, to maintain some shadow of consistency, denies also the resurrection of the body: No. 3. page 67.—So does he the ascension of our Saviour's body, ~~if not~~ his resurrection, in No. 2. ch. 9. in which, he has falsified the scriptures, and made void the hopes of the children of God from the beginning.

To

To do this, with impunity; he pretends that the scriptures are an allegory—that there are allegories in the scriptures, I deny not. But they do not destroy facts; and make void the truth of relation, and narrative, contained therein: *Paul*, speaking of *Abraham's* affair with the bond-woman, calls it indeed an allegory—but *Paul*, in so saying, does not deny that there was such a person as *Abraham*, nor that he had a son by a slave: but his allegory consisted in a spiritual doctrine, concealed under that fact; until revealed to him by the Holy Ghost.

Where allegories have no affinity to facts, and to facts properly stated, and ascertained; the man who attempts to build by them, is as though he attempted to build castles in the air: Such kind of a building is *Coppin's*: who will have it, that the resurrection, and ascension of the Lord *Christ*, is to be understood spiritually or allegorically only.

This brings to my remembrance, the dream of a certain visionary, who would be an instructor of others: This person, not long since, being in company where the siege of *Samaria* was talked of, of what distresses the inhabitants felt, how a woman in the rage and fury of hunger eat her own child, &c. The same person, then asked, with a contemptuous smile, whether they thought the thing *literally* true, or not? Upon their answering in the affirmative, the person replied: It is not true in your sense; I myself am the *Samaria*: and have been so very straitly besieged; that I was obliged to eat my first-born, *i. e.* that inward
goodness

goodness, which I had brought forth in sorrow ; and until then had nourished so carefully.

But to return ; I confess myself simple enough to believe all things that are written in the law, and in the prophets ; and that I have hope towards God, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead : I particularly reverence the testimony of the evangelists, concerning *Jesus Christ* our Lord. And in them we learn, that our Saviour was God incarnate, God manifest in the flesh, the word made flesh, &c. and that he was a real man ; he had a reasonable soul, and a material body : that from infancy to a perfect state of manhood, he lived upon this earth ; going about doing good, and fulfilling all righteousness. And, that as a man, he felt pain, sickness, weariness, hunger, thirst, joy, sorrow, &c. That in the article of his sufferings, his soul was sorrowful, even to death ; whilst his body was scourged, crowned with thorns, spit upon, buffeted, and treated with the utmost indignity. And after all, by many wounds, he was nailed to a cross ; where, having vented strong cries and tears, he expired under the torment. That, when dead, he was taken down from the cross and laid in a sepulchre, wherein never man was laid before—that a guard of soldiers was appointed to watch the tomb, lest his disciples should steal him away—that on the third morning, notwithstanding all their pre-caution, the angels descended ; and smiting the keepers with deadly fear, rolled the stone from the mouth of the tomb : (this was altogether unnecessary if the material body did not rise again)—that the very identical body of
our

our Saviour, which was laid in that grave, did then arise; and shewed himself alive to his disciples. All this I assuredly believe. He first convinced his disciples of the truth of his resurrection, by his well-known form and features; by his voice, manner and matter of speech. He secondly shewed them the wounds in his hands and his feet, by which he had been nailed to the cross: as they well knew how he had been treated; those marks, being perfectly correspondent, shewed them it was he. Thirdly, he proposed to *Thomas* (who was the most incredulous of them all) in the presence of the ten, that he should put his hand into his side, and his fingers into the nail-prints: and to them all, he proposed that they should handle him, and see, for that a spirit had not flesh and bones, as they might perceive him to have.

He conversed with them, he eat and drank in their presence; and gave them every possible and necessary proof of his resurrection, in that material, individual, identical body; which was crucified and laid in the sepulchre. After continuing with them for the space of forty days, he, (in their presence, before their eyes) lifting up his hands and blessing them, ascended up on high: an intervening cloud receiving him out of their sight. And they were then told, *that that same Jesus should come in like manner as they had seen him ascend.*

Now, as it is manifest, that he retained the identity, and corporeity of his body, to the moment of his ascension; it belongs to the opposers to tell us what became of his body, if it did not ascend; what mountain, or hill,

was

was it found upon afterwards? did it dissolve into air? or is it preserved somewhere until he come again? (because they were taught, that he should come again, in like manner as they had seen him ascend) If it is, let them tell us where? Did not the manner wherein they saw him ascend, and in which he was to come again, relate to the reality of his person, and the method of his ascent? and also to their seeing him with their bodily eyes? I think it did: Let such who think the contrary, convince me of my error if they can.

Again, if the body of *Christ* did not ascend, it will be pretty difficult to affix a meaning to the term: It cannot be applied to the godhead; the nature and properties of which, denies all circumscription and passibility: nor can it be applied to the human soul only, for reasons given below *.

To

* The terms *descend*, and *ascend*, implies; either a change of state, or change of place, or both. But the godhead as omnipresent, impassible, unchangeable, &c. cannot admit of change in either: Therefore, these terms cannot be applied to our Saviour respecting his godhead only—Nor have they a limited application to his soul: because it doth not appear, that our Saviour ever manifested his person, his glory, his salvation, but as in the matter and form of a human body.—He is represented, as inhabitant in such a body, at the formation of *Adam*—when, as the image and likeness of God; he was also the first born, and the beginning of his creation; exhibiting in himself, the model after which man was to be created. In the form, and manner, of a human body, he appeared unto *Abraham*—in the same manner, and form, he wrestled with *Jacob*—in the same likeness he appeared to *Moses*, *Joshua*, *Job*, *Isaiab*, &c. And in such a body he always manifested himself unto his apostles, as well after his resur-

To turn all the scripture-account of our Saviour's resurrection, and ascension, into such an allegory, as destroys the facts; is just the same, as if they denied that there ever was such a person as *Paul* the apostle: but that all that is said of him, relates to certain dispensations which mankind pass under in their own minds. And again, in history; it is as though we should aver, that there never was such a person as our king *Harry* the fifth: but, that the tradition of such a person, and of his battles, and victories in *France*; relate altogether to the good principle in man, the divine power fighting and conquering in the *France* of our nature.

What would be our conceptions of such a ranting spirit as this, madly drawing every thing into that devouring vortex, HIMSELF? I believe, that the most charitable constructions
we

resurrection, as before: and in the same manner doth the Holy Ghost now reveal him: when he takes of the things which are his, and shews them unto us. Hence it is manifest, that the Lord Jesus always occupied a human body; both in matter, and form: particularly in his descension and ascension. When he descended to a fellow-feeling with the creatures, even to the lowest depth of human misery; it was in the whole man, consisting of body and soul. When he descended into torment, where the pangs of death encompassed him round about, and the pains of hell gat hold upon him; it was as the whole man, consisting of body and soul. In the same sense he descended into the chambers of death, exploring the sides of the pit; and sinking to the lower parts of the earth. The apostle assures us that, he that descended, is the same also that ascended, up far above all heavens. Upon which authority, we affirm; that the body of the Lord Jesus is risen from the dead, and ascended up on high—otherwise he who descended, is not the same that ascended.

we could possibly put upon such sentiments, would amount to this: The poor creature is altogether under the baneful influence of ignorance and pride.

And is not this the case with the author, whose writings are the subject of my present consideration, and indeed with the mystics in general? do not they pretend to account for the truth of all things in themselves? They certainly draw all scripture-facts, such as the incarnation, personality, birth, life, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension of *Christ*; into their own vortex: and deny their reality, or at least their usefulness in any other sense.

I need not use many arguments to prove, that whilst a man, by such a conduct, betrays the most wretched ignorance of himself: he also gives evidence sufficient, of his being one of the children of pride. The blessed *Jesus* saith of himself, I am the truth. But the person above-mentioned, contests the point with him: by declaring that the truth of all things is to be looked for in man. And thus as a thief and a robber, he steals the brightest jewel in *Immanuel's* crown; to ornament self with.

Allow but the facts of the resurrection, and ascension of our Saviour's body; and then you may spiritualize as much, as high, as refined as you please upon it; provided you always crown the head, by keeping the pre-eminence and exaltation of our Saviour's person in view: otherwise, the spirit which is in you, with all its niceties and appearances of piety, is but an antichrist.

If

If the resurrection of our Saviour's body, be ascertained in the scriptures; and guaranteed by all the apostles, as it surely is; we may easily come to a determination; concerning the resurrection and future state of our own bodies: for the apostle tells us, that our bodies shall be fashioned like unto the glorious body of the Son of God. The New-Testament teaches us, that the resurrection of the Lord *Jesus*, his state, as then appearing and manifesting himself, is the perfect pattern, and sample of our state and condition eternally with God.

What does the term resurrection imply, if not the rising again to life, of that which was subjected to death? But the soul is immortal, as proved from scripture and reason, and cannot die. It is the body *only* that dies: Therefore the future resurrection of the dead, if there be any, must be that of the body, and of the body only: otherwise there is no meaning in the term.

I confess that the term is sometimes used in the scriptures, as respecting the raising again of mankind in the second *Adam*; from that death of trespasses and sin, wherein they were involved in the first *Adam*. There are those also, who apply it to that quickening, or renewal, which is effected and wrought in the spirit of the mind, through the manifestation of the truth.

To limit and confine the term to this, is certainly to deny a future resurrection, and to commence disciples of *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*; of whom hear what the apostle *Paul* saith: *Their word will eat as doth a canker, who con-*

cerning the truth, have erred; saying, that the resurrection is passed already: and overthrow the faith of some. For an Infidel, a Deist, to set up his own opinions in opposition to the apostle, is not to be wondered at: but for people professing themselves Christians, who acknowledge the spirit speaking by the apostles, to be infallible: for such to prefer the instigations of a private spirit, to the public testimony of the divine word: is very strange and inconsistent.

For my own part, I do not see that death dissolves the union between soul and body, any more than what sleep doth. In sleep, the body is passive and inactive, as in a state of death: and yet the union of soul and body is discoverable in sleep.—So also in epileptic fits, &c. when the body is deprived of motion, and senseless as a corpse; when all the channels of advice are stoppt, and the common sensorium deprived of intelligence: the soul doth *then* evidence her own existence; and confesses her union to the body, by retaining its organs: which she occupies in the spiritual world; (of which world the soul herself is a native) though according to things present, she hath ceased from the exercise of the material eye, ear, hands, &c.

Death being only a sleep, a state of suspension, respecting the exercise of bodily functions, destroys not the unity of soul and body; nor does it hinder, but that the soul possesses the bodily organs, in her consciousness of unity to the body.

Should

Should it be objected, that death is such a sleep as destroys the body: I answer, The change, or alteration of the body in death, respects form and manner only, and doth not imply the loss of matter: or that it loseth its identity: And therefore, I deny that death annihilates the body. The scriptures speak of man, as consisting of three parts: body, soul, and spirit. The body is meerly material, earthly, inactive and senseless: And yet the body itself, is fearfully and wonderfully made: That wisdom, power, and glory which manifest themselves, in the exquisite workmanship and structure of the human body, effectually demonstrate that it was built for eternity; and not for a moment of time only.

The second part of man, called his spirit, is his senses: This spirit, dwells *in*, and is united *unto* the whole body; even *in*, and unto every minute part thereof. This spirit, is guardian to the body, discovers bodily dangers, and concerns itself for the prevention of them. It also discovers what is good for the body, assenting to it, and chusing it. This is the spirit, that immediately occupies the bodily organs in this material world. It hears through the ear; it sees through the eye; it smells through the nostrils; it tastes through the palate; it feels through the skin: and swifter than lightning, it sends intelligence of all its discoveries to the common sensorium: where, in the head, as in the pre-eminent member, the spirit hath its highest residence: according to the determinations there, which are as speedily communica-

ted to the whole; the passions predominate: either love, joy, sorrow, hatred, anger, &c. Thus far this spirit is in common to men and brutes.

But this spirit in man, as dwelling in, and united unto every minute part of his body, is also united to his soul: And thus becomes the medium of unity between soul and body, in the rational creature.

The soul in man, is an immortal consciousness of existence, having the powers of thinking, reasoning, reflection, will, resolution, &c. — This soul, united to the animal spirit in man; improves, and raises that spirit in him, much above what it is in the brutes. Thus, though the faculty of speech be in common to man and other creatures, as birds, &c: yet the latter has not the power of invention, order and reason, and can only speak at random what they hear. But man has reason, invention, order and design in his speech: which proves, that the principal, or head of the triad, in his composition; is a spiritual dignity.

As the soul in man, is immediately united to the spirit, and the spirit to the body; I would observe, that the soul always retains the spirit: Hence it is said, that the spirit of a man goeth upward (*i. e.* in conjunction with the soul which is divine) whilst the spirit of a beast (as not having a divine and immortal soul) goeth downward.

As the soul, in man, retains the spirit, and lifts it upward with herself—so does the Spirit also retain the body, in its organical system: even when

when the material machinery is subjected to corruption, and ferment in the grave *.

In a dream, when the body is as dead, the soul, by the medium of the animal spirit, occupies its organs; and feels the passions, sometimes to very great degree. Nor, doth the body's being in the grave, hinder the soul, (who by the medium of the spirit, holds the body in union through all its changes) from so retaining the organical system thereof, as to feel the passions; as perfectly at least as she does in a dream—for which reason, the apostle with the utmost propriety calls death a sleep.

And here, it may not be improper to observe, that sleep doth not always imply rest. There is a sleep; which, with very unpleasant dreams, extremely troubles the mind; and fatigues the body: Tired, distressed, and tormented; we find gladness in awakening from such a sleep; and rest, in reflecting that our misery was but a dream.

I have been credibly informed, by some who have undergone the operation; that after the amputation of a diseased member, the patient has felt pain, (in every particular to their senses) as if in the separated limb: just as though

B 3

it

* May we not suppose that the soul, by the medium of the animal spirit, may (even after death) retain the body: respecting its mode, and its necessary conjunction; for the operations of the soul: in a manner ineffable, and peculiar to such a state? whence through the organs thereof, as suited to the spiritual world; the soul may be capable of hearing, seeing, feeling, &c. and also of *appearance* in an ærial, or shadowy form: and of subjection to the passions—so far, as to render her susceptible of joy, or misery, in a future state?

it was yet in union with the body. The truth of this I shall not attempt to investigate here: Yet I profess to see no cause, why the soul, through the animal spirit, may not, according to the laws and powers of union; feel as *by* and *in* the body, though the latter according to sense be put off: And if so, the soul cannot but long for the time; when the body having undergone its necessary ferment, shall be raised in glory and immortality; like unto that of the son of God: a fit habitation for a spirit to dwell in.

We look for the reality of all the joys, and representations, which we have in dreams; unto those that we have when awake: when the whole machinery is in exercise. So may departed spirits look forwards, from their visionary enjoyments: for perfection, for consummate bliss, to the restitution of all things. When the body shall be raised; when the creature itself shall be restored from the bondage of corruption, and brought into the glorious liberty of the sons of God—when the redemption (to wit, that of the body) shall be fully come—when every seed shall have its own body.

The apostle saith, *If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abram's seed*—And elsewhere, speaking of our Saviour, he saith, that *he took upon him the seed of Abram*—And again, that we are *one flesh* with him—that we are *his fulness*—that we are *members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones*. From these, and many other testimonies in the divine word, it appears that we are comprehended in *Christ*: our bodies, in his body; and
our

our souls, in his soul: He being in himself, the fountain of lives.

If it be true then, that *Christ* saved himself, in the whole man, consisting of body and soul; as his resurrection sufficiently demonstrates: then were *our* bodies, saved in *his* body; and *our* souls, in *his* soul. Unto which salvation, *i. e.* of *our* souls, in *his* soul; we come up even in *this* life—when through the knowledge of the truth, we attain to the *end of our faith*. But we are yet obliged to wait, for the redemption: to wit, that of the body. We cannot come up, in the present state of things, according to our bodies, to the state of *Christ's* perfect body: Therefore the apostle says, *We look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body.*

But, if the redemption of our souls, in the soul of *Christ*, did not destroy their individuality; nor prevent their being brought up, through the knowledge of the truth, unto the enjoyment of that salvation, which they had in his soul: Wherefore, should it be supposed, that notwithstanding the redemption of our bodies, in his body, *they* must lose their individuality, *they* must not rise again, nor be brought up to inherit that salvation which they have in the body of *Christ*? Let me say, as there was a time for the one; so there remains a time for the other: when the whole man shall be saved; when both in body and soul, he shall be for ever with the Lord.

Again, the practice of those who deny the resurrection of the body, gives their opinion the lie. Why are they so remarkably fond of their bodies? to feed them, to dress them, to

beautify them, to preserve them in health and vigour, to honour them—and to gratify their appetites, is the whole employment of life—what are all the cares, and toils of life, directed to, but to the body? Man, can reap no other advantage, than food, and cloathing, from all his labours beneath the sun.

What fools then, to make such a momentary being, as the body; the sole object of our care and concern! And to be so very unwilling to part with them; which excepting lunacy, is manifestly the case with every man: *No man hateth his own body.* I will suppose that the apostle, who bare this testimony, had at least, as much understanding as a man, and as much divine light and real piety, as a Christian; as *Coppin*; his admirers; or, as any mystic whatever—And yet he, though he knew; that he had a building of God; an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens: and was desirous of being cloathed upon, with that garment of immortality: (I say) though he was well assured of this, yet he says, *not for that we would be uncloathed—but cloathed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.* By which, he means as I suppose, that he was not desirous of being found naked: by the loss of his body—but his desire was to be cloathed upon—both body, and soul, with that glory and immortality which God had prepared for him.

And again, he saith in another place, *Behold I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. (For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible;*

ble; and we shall be changed.) I apprehend his meaning in those words, to be, that such who are alive, at the end of time, shall not die: but that they shall cease from all vile, earthly qualities, in a moment; in the twinkling of an eye: The body shall be purified, and changed, without putting it off: into an incorruptible state—*The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.* He not only assures us here, of the body's being saved, and of its entering into glory: but also of its salvation, and entrance into bliss, without tasting death.

Should some poor anchorite in the desert, consumed with famine, exposed to cold, and nakedness, sinking under his infirmities, and whose whole life in the body, is one continual penance. I say, should such an one deny the resurrection of the body, as not feeling much consolation from its existence: it would have some appearance. But for those, whose time, labour, and study, are spent altogether on account of the body; and whose chief felicity in life, seems to consist in gratifying its appetites. I say, for such to deny its future bliss, and to treat it only as a pampered beast, whereon they ride for a season, is to act a very unreasonable, and inconsistent part.

But so it is: The child of affliction believing, that his poor famished or diseased body shall rise again, and be fashioned like unto the glorious body of the son of God; he lays it down in hope—whilst the worldly, jolly, pretended-spiritual man—the refined genius, as he would be thought—(though possibly he hath not one abstracted idea, of existence, separate from the body)

body) unreasonably suggests, that the body being meerly brutal; shall as such, perish in death everlastingly.

Because the scriptures say, *That flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God.—And that being sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body*: there are those who infer, that the body shall not rise again. But I would observe, that the terms *flesh*, and *blood*, as used in the scriptures; doth not always imply, the material body. Sometimes it intends man's natural wisdom, understanding, and reason; as where our Saviour says to *Peter*, *Flesh and blood hath not revealed those things unto thee—but my Father which is in heaven*. Are there any so stupid, as to imagine that the Lord meant, thy body has not revealed those things unto thee? Upon a serious consideration I hope there are none such.

Again, the term intends ease, honour, and profit, according to this world. Hence the apostle tells us, that when it pleased God to reveal his son in him, he conferred not with *flesh and blood*: but gave himself up to preach *Jesus* unto the *Heathen*.

Again, it intends our own righteousnesses.—The apostle *Paul*, calls his circumcision on the eighth day—his being of the stock of *Israel*—his being of an orthodox, and respectable sect—his zeal in his religion—his blameless righteousness as touching the law. I say, he calls all this *flesh*. And in this sense the divine evangelist understood it: When speaking of the sons of God, he tells us, that *they were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, &c.* *Paul* uses the term *flesh*, in the same sense, in another place, where
he

he says, *So then, they that are in the flesh, cannot please God. And again, having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh.* But Paul does not mean, that they that are in the body, cannot please God—because he tells us elsewhere, that *Enoch, before his translation, had this testimony, that he pleased God.*

At other times the term is not limited to our supposed excellencies, &c. but used in a more indefinite sense; including all the weaknesses, frailties, and corruption of our mortal state—and in this sense it is used in the abovementioned text, *i. e.* flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. It is evident, that the apostle does not apply the term in those words, to the material body; nor did he intend to deny the resurrection thereof. But his design was to shew the necessity of the body's being purged, through death, from all the base qualities and infirmities, which constitute what he terms flesh and blood; and which, he says, cannot inherit the kingdom of God.

He explains himself more fully in the following words—*Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.* But we are not pleading for the resurrection of a corrupt body—nay, we should then gain nothing by the change. The body of man, as the immediate creation of God, was incorrupt—corruption as applied to man, in body or mind, certainly intends, the evil bias, and vile propensities of human nature. Or, if by a corrupt body, we understand, its purulency, its liableness to putrefaction—I would observe that the latter, is only an effect of the former. And that it neither is essential to the being, or existence,

istence, of the body nor soul : Corruption in the first sense, is an accident only in man, and no part of him ; and disease, death, or corruption, in the second sense, is to be considered, meerly, as the effect or consequence of the former, and can only subsist by it ; and *where* that is found. *Christ* being made sin for us, sustained corruption in the first sense ; but as he totally eradicated it, put it away, and destroyed it ; by his sufferings, and death, he did not see corruption in the second sense : that is, his body did not putrify, nor moulder to dust—Thou wilt not *suffer thy holy one to see corruption.*

But our bodies are not thus privileged, because they are vile, flesh and blood, or corruption dwells in them—They like the house that had the leprosy in the walls, must be taken down for the destruction of the plague. We who make our exit, before the time of the end, must see corruption, because our bodies are vile. But we are taught that they shall be raised in incorruption : yea, we have the pattern exhibited in perfection, in the glorious body of our divine *Immanuel* : In him, we view the glorious reality, of what we are *with* God, and *to* God, and of what we shall be, *in*, and *unto* ourselves, when raised from the dead.

As to the proposition, that the body is fown natural, and raised spiritual. I would observe, that natural and spiritual, are distinct and opposite *qualities* only ; and not distinct beings. Therefore, the change from natural to spiritual, doth not imply, that one being is lost, nor that one being becomes another : but it implies, that all those qualities which constituted the natural character,

character, being destroyed in death, the body rises in the qualities which constitute the spiritual character. And thus the body is sown a natural body; and raised a spiritual body: First, the body is natural from its manner of subsisting, as by meats, drinks, sleep, &c. Again, it is natural from its infirmities; such as hunger, thirst, weariness, pain, sickness, and death. Again, the body is natural from its affections, and operations, as generation, augmentation, motion, &c.

The body as subject to these, is a natural body; but having put off (by death) all these, it becomes a spiritual body; a body subsisting without the use of natural means; such as meats, drinks, sleep, physic, &c. A body free from all infirmities, and from all earthly affections, and operations. A body, though retaining its materiality, yet in the resurrection as the angels of God.

Know you not, saith the apostle, that your bodies are members of *Christ*? Shall I then take the members of *Christ*, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid. To which I may say, shall we take the members of *Christ* and destroy them? shall we assert, that they have no pre-eminence above a beast, but that they must perish everlastingly? God forbid.

When *Lazarus* died, and *Jesus* approached to raise him from the dead, one of the sisters of the deceased, went forth to meet him; and in reverence to the Saviour (whilst she bewailed her departed brother) she said, *Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died.* Unto which, the compassionate High-Priest answered,

ed, *Thy brother shall rise again.* Yea Lord; (said she) *I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.* Jesus replied, *I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth, and believeth on me, shall never die. Believest thus this?* She said unto him, *Yea Lord.* That *Martha* believed the resurrection of the body at the last day, is declared in words as expressive as can possibly be used: nor did our Saviour reprove her sentiment (for it is highly probable that she had received it from him) he only taught her, that the resurrection of the human body, doth not proceed from natural consequences, but that it depended altogether upon him. *I am the resurrection and the life*, saith he. The fact of our Saviour's resurrection, doth not only ascertain that of ours; exhibiting the most glorious and shining pattern thereof; but it is also the cause, the means and security of our resurrection. It may also denote that power, wherewith he, as the Son of man, stands invested by the Father. *Martha* believed that her brother should rise again at the last day: But our Saviour taught her, that as her brother could not rise *then*, without him who was the resurrection and the life: so neither was his power confined to that day; but that he could exert it when it pleased him so to do: and which he then intended to do, by raising her brother from the grave.

It is said of the apostles, that they preached, through Jesus, the resurrection from the dead. And again of Paul, that he preached Jesus, and

and the resurrection: and when they heard of the resurrection, some mocked. Of the hope and resurrection of the dead, (saith the same apostle) am I called in question. Again, That there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just, and of the unjust. Our Saviour saith, The hour is coming, in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. And the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept, arose and came out of the graves, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many.—If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; our faith is vain, and our preaching vain; ye are yet in your sins. Abram accounted, that God was able to raise up Isaac, even from the dead. But not to multiply citations, it is manifest, that the resurrection of the body, is positively and clearly taught in the New-Testament: and was a principal article in the preaching of the apostles.

But some man, such as Coppin, and his admirers, will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, saith the apostle, that which thou sowest, is not quickened except it die. The intention of this answer is to teach us, that as the death and ferment of the grain sown in the ground, hinders not its rising again; but is rather absolutely necessary to its springing up in a plant: so the death of the human body, is no hindrance to it rising again. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be.

This

This is to shew us, that the body being sown natural, and raised spiritual, is not the same in its resurrection, as it was in its death: because (as I have shewn before) all those qualities which constituted the natural character, are destroyed in death: and the spiritual character as no longer restrained, and concealed by the former, is now perfectly sustained in the resurrection. The body thus changed, is said, not to be the same body; that is, the comparison, which proves, that the sown body, is not the same as the risen body; doth not respect its materiality, or identical existence, but its *qualities*; or *mode* of existence only.

Where the apostle saith, Thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, &c. There are none so simple, I suppose, as to imagine that the apostle would not have us expect to reap wheat, where we sow wheat: or that by another body, we are to expect *barley* where wheat is sown. Nay,^{*} his design is to shew us, that though the grain sown be bare, and simple, yet it riseth a glorious body, producing many-fold: as an emblem of the body, which is sown in corruption, but raised in glory; even an hundred fold, when compared with what it has in this life.

The grain which is sown, respecting its substance, is not lost: for though it ferments and dies, it shoots upwards into the stalk. Were you *then* to take the stalk properly out of the earth, you shall find that the sown grain, is fast at the root in appearance: but upon examination, you may perceive, that all its substance, every material particle, containing all its genuine

ine qualities are spent; are risen in the plant; and nothing remains but the chaff, or husk, which is all of it that is lost. This is a simile of the resurrection: All the original genuine properties of the body are preserved; and nothing lost but the chaff: *i. e.* the base qualities that adhered to it. *But God giveth it a body, as it hath pleased him; and to every seed its own body.* The meaning of which, I apprehend to be, that God, without accounting for his ways to man, without their being able to comprehend the depths of his wisdom, and power, is pleased in an ineffable manner, to give a body to the sown seed. Bewildered, and lost, in the researches of reason, we are constrained to resolve all into the good pleasure of God. *God giveth it a body, as it hath pleased him; and to every seed, its own body.* But if God does not give a human body, to every human body sown, how can every seed be said to have its own body?

In the passages above-cited, the apostle is manifestly speaking of the future resurrection of the body: but Mr. *Coppin*, and his admirers, will not so understand him. They will make it out in such a manner, as says that the resurrection is past. Thus erring concerning the truth, and overthrowing the faith of some; in *The advancement of all things in Christ*, &c. Chap. 6. he speaks thus, "God hath sowed the seed, " or planted the image of eternity, the image of " the divine Being, the image of himself, " which is *Jesus Christ*, in this world, as in " general, so particularly in *Adam*—in the " flesh of *Christ*—in the flesh of his saints—
C " in

“ in the whole world of things.” What has this unscriptural, this unmeaning proposition, to do with the matter in hand? what hath it to do with that scripture-passage, of which it is a pretended exposition? what affinity has the phraseology, or sense, (if it has any sense) of his propositions, to this interrogation? *How are the dead raised, and with what body do they come?* And what relation doth it bear to the apostle’s answer, *Thou fool, &c.* except an assertion of right, to appropriate the character?

The term, image; as applied to God, may be understood in various senses. Kings, and magistrates, from their power and rule, may be said to be the image of God. Any person, exercising himself in works of mercy, compassion, love, benevolence, &c. may be said, in so doing, to be an image of God.—The sun is an image of his brightness; the rock of his stability; the fire of his purity, &c. In this sense, all creatures may be considered as having somewhat of the divine image: The heavens declare thy power, and firmament sheweth forth thine handy work.

But, if by the image of God, we mean the assemblage of all divine perfections; represented, and reflected, as in a mirror, which in the scripture, is the primary sense of the term: there is then, none other image of God, than *Jesus Christ*: He is the brightness of the glory of God, and the express image of his person. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God, is in the face of *Jesus Christ*. *Coppin* says, that God planted this divine image in *Adam*: but neither the prophets, nor apostles, say so.

Moses

Moses indeed tells us, that God made man in his own image, and after his own likeness. But this image, and likeness of God, *in* whom, and *after* whom, man was made; was *Jesus Christ*: the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

God, eternal, invisible, immortal, incomprehensible, was pleased to exhibit an image of himself, of his own nature, and properties, in the person of his Son; who was with him, as one brought up with him from everlasting. By which medium he wrought all his works. And in which he was known, and his glories reflected on the angels, and on all the heavenly powers. In this image, and after his model and similitude (he being the head of mankind) was *Adam* formed. *Adam* was so far from being the express image of God in himself, or from having it planted, or sown in him; that he, in his brightest perfection and glory, was but an outward, shadowy, fleeting figure, of him who is the perfect, express, unchangeable, and eternal image of the invisible God.—Hence the apostle calls *Adam* the figure of him that was to come.

Again, instead of acknowledging *Christ* himself to be the image of God, he talks of the image of God, being sown, or planted in the human nature of *Christ*; and that when *Christ* laid down his flesh, by the death of the cross, this image was raised up into the divine nature, where it lives forever. Here he shews himself to be a divider of *Christ*, by distinguishing the *Christ*, from the person of *Jesus of Nazareth*. In this he seems to follow *Cerinthus*, a person who lived in the first century; who held, that *Jesus* was the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*; but that

Christ, in the form of a dove, descended upon him at his baptism: and that when *Jesus* suffered death, *Christ* flew up into heaven, without being sensible of any inconvenience. To confute the errors of this heretic, and his followers, *John* is reported to have wrote his gospel. *Coppin* in his definition of the true *Christ*; says, he is to be in us, to redeem and save us as he was in the man *Christ Jesus*. He also says, that when *Jesus* laid down his flesh, by the death of the cross, (the *Christ*, or) the image of God, was raised up into the divine nature, where it lives forever.

By saying that the image of God which *Christ* had in his human nature, was at his death, raised up into the divine nature, where it lives forever: he affirms, either that the body, or flesh of *Christ*, did not rise again; but that his human nature perished and ceased to be in death: Or otherwise, that though his human nature doth now exist, it is not the image of God: nay, the image of God doth not so much as dwell in it *now*, according to him. But the image of God is raised up into the divine nature, where it lives forever. According to which, there is no exhibited image of God now. These things are so horribly blasphemous, and antichristian; that they need neither the argument of reason, nor scripture, to confute them.

Again, what a rant it is, to talk of the image of God being planted in the flesh of his saints! and then to quote sundry passages of scripture, in support thereof: which bear no more relation to *his* proposition, than they do to the *Coran*.

I have already shewn from scripture, experience, and reason, that there is no such thing as
the

the divine image, or good principle dwelling in the individuals of mankind: neither in their flesh, nor spirit; and therefore shall say no more to it here.

Nor will I spend my time, to shew the impropriety of asserting, that this image is sown in the whole world of things; but shall leave the superlatively enlightned, to admire, and worship the divine image, in dogs, swine, serpents, &c. which are not creatures of the *smallest* consequence, in the whole world of things.

Thus, according to this author, the dead, or the seed sown, is *Jesus Christ*, or the divine image. And that this seed, was sown, died, and was buried, in the human nature, or flesh of man; and in the whole world of things.

—That God raises this dead seed, or *Christ*, by his voice; And being risen in us, it returns to God again: whilst the nature and persons of men, with the whole world of things, are all left behind to perish. “Thus, (saith he) God hath
“carried the image of himself, through all
“things in the world, and to the end of all
“things again even to himself.” (And again)
“This is the last and general resurrection.”

Without doing him any injury, I may venture to affirm: that his doctrines are unscriptural, and unreasonable: tending to the subversion of christianity in general. For first, with *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, he affirms, that the resurrection is past already. Secondly, he denies that the body rises at all. Thirdly, he denies that man, or any part of him, is the object of salvation. Fourthly, he asserts that the persons of men, having no pre-eminence above a beast, shall perish everlastingly as the beast.

Whether this man understood the apostles, or payed any regard to their doctrine, or not, I leave the reader to judge: and shall here observe, that if the matter in hand, had related only to the resurrection of *our bodies*; I should not have meddled with it: but should have left *Coppin* and his admirers, to the time of the restitution of all things; when every man shall be restored to his right senses; at least, so far as to distinguish between truth and error. But the apostle shews us, that if the doctrine of the resurrection be not true, if there be no resurrection of the dead, then *Christ* is not raised: and if he be not risen, then our preaching is vain: our faith is vain: we are yet in our sins. Thus it appears to be, (not a meer opinion, a speculation, or fable; but) a matter of the utmost importance: the source, and evidence of our salvation: our happiness in time and in eternity.

Again, this author, denies the human nature of *Christ*, No. 2. page 26. where he scoffs at a corporal *Christ*: and No. 3. page 58, 59. where he more than once, treats the doctrine of our Saviour's having a body of flesh and bones, with sneers and derision: as also in sundry parts of his book, intituled, *The advancement of all things in Christ*, &c. How amazing! that any person who believes, or even pretends to believe the scriptures, should dispute the truth of our Saviour's having a body of flesh and bones: when the evangelists assure us, that the Lord *Jesus*, after his resurrection, was particularly careful, to give his disciples the fullest evidence, the most indisputable proof, of his
being

being risen ; in the very same body wherein he suffered and died.

Of the truth of this, he convinced their eyes, their ears, their hands, and heart.—He who knew all things, foresaw that men of perverse minds would arise : who, (though they confessed themselves christians) would contest, and deny, the reality of his resurrection. His form, his features, his voice, his wounds, the materiality of his flesh and bones ; all which were manifest, and proved to a demonstration ; perfectly convinced his disciples, that the same, individual, material body of *Jesus*, which was crucified, died, and was buried, was risen from the dead ; nor was it possible for them to be deceived, by any phantom or shadowy appearance ; because he convinced them of his having flesh, and bones ; which they very well knew, were not the properties of a spirit.

Behold my hands, and my feet, (saith our Saviour) that it is I myself : handle me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And again to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side : and be not faithless, but believing. But the *Christ*, whom *Coppin*, and his admirers reverence, neither is, nor was capable of making any such proposal to his followers ; because he has no body of flesh and bones ; nor indeed has he any other existence, than in their antichristian conceit.

That the *Christ* whom the apostles preached, had a body of flesh and bones, is manifest : where *Paul* tells the church, that they are *members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.*

But this proposition, cannot possibly be true, if *Christ* has no body of flesh and bones; as this author asserts. Let God be true, and every man a liar. The word of truth assures us, that he has a body of flesh and bones; and that this body, notwithstanding all its wounds and bruises, was so preserved that not a bone thereof was broken. But it was preserved to no purpose, if it did not rise again: or, if it was lost afterwards.—The Holy Ghost, bearing witness of the Lord *Jesus*, by the prophets; testifies, that a bone of him should not be broken. Speaking of the passover, the type of *Christ*; he says, *Neither shall ye break a bone thereof*, *Exod. xii. 46.* And again, *nor break any bone of it*, *Num. ix. 12.* And again, *He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken*, *Psal. xxxiv. 20.* And, that this related to the body of the Lord *Jesus*, the evangelist *John* bare witness. Our Saviour, and those who suffered with him, being crucified on the eve of an high sabbath among the Jews; the latter besought *Pilate* (as the crucified were long dying) that they might have leave to break their legs: and to take them down, that their bodies might not be seen on their crosses on the following day: To this he consented; upon which, they brake the legs of those who were crucified with our Lord; but when they came to *Jesus*, and saw that he was already dead, they brake not his legs. And the beloved disciple in his remarks upon this, says, *for these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken*, *John xix. 36.* Thus, the apostle shews that it was not accident, but the
the

the purpose and council of God, that defeated the design of the *Jews*: when they would have broken his legs with the others. Nor are we to respect it as a trifling, or common occurrence: That would be to impeach the wisdom of God, who had so long before his sufferings, declared by his prophets, that a bone of him should not be broke

The preservation of our Saviour's body was for his own glory, and for the benefit and advantage of mankind. As mankind were comprehended in his body, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone; it denoted their final preservation and security in the same body: Not the smallest member, was to be separated from the whole; nor the body from the head: that we might live by him. It also denoted his faithfulness, power, and love, in preserving the whole body, all that had been committed to his trust.

Again, Mr. *Richard Coppin* by proposing *Christ* to be a meer quality in man, denies his person, No. 1. page 13. He says that *Christ* "is to be in you to teach, redeem, and save you, as he was in the man *Christ Jesus*." Thus according to him, the man *Christ Jesus*, who was born at *Bethlehem* of a pure virgin, who wrought many miracles, and went about doing good; who suffered, and died upon a cross, in the reign of *Tiberias Cæsar*; and who rose again from the dead, on the third day; I say, according to *Coppin*, this person was not the *Christ*, in spirit, and truth: but that the true *Christ* was in him only, to redeem, and save him;

him ; in like manner as he is to be in the people.

And No. 3. pag. 59. he says : “ And you say, “ When Christ, who is our life, shall appear ; “ then shall we also appear with him in glory : “ and this life, even Christ, you say is eternal “ life. Then I answer, this must not be meant “ of a body of flesh, and bones, for that cannot be our eternal life. And this life, the “ apostles then waited for, and received ; which “ was a spiritual Christ, even Christ in them “ the hope of glory : and not a fleshly personal “ Christ as you say ; for how can such a one be “ in us to be our eternal life ? ”

If I mistake not, Mr. *Coppin* intitles his works, [in defence of which, that which now is a re-publishing in numbers, was written :] *A Blow at the Serpent*. But whether his admirers will excuse me or not, I am obliged to give it a new title ; and as I think a very just one ; *i. e.* A BLOW AT THE SEED OF THE WOMAN.

He says, that Christ as a person, or as having a body of flesh, and bones, cannot be our eternal life. That our Saviour hath a body of flesh, and bones, I have already proved from the scriptures. And I shall now endeavour to prove, that the person of Christ, as having such a body, is our eternal life.

Our Saviour, in the 6th of *John* ; declares that his flesh is meat indeed, and that his blood is drink indeed. And saith, who so eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life. But how can we eat or drink what hath no existence ? can a man fill his belly with the east wind ?

wind? can he drink of a river, whose waters are cut off, and whose streams are perfectly dried up? We answer, he cannot. It is not merely saying to the body, be fed, that feeds it: nor, will our bidding it be warm, administer any heat to it.

As the Lord *Jesus*, has proposed to all generations, that such who eat his flesh, and drink his blood, hath eternal life; shall live thereby, &c. I think I may venture to propose, with as much confidence, and upon much better grounds than *Coppin* asserts the contrary: that our Saviour always has a body, a material body, a body of flesh and bones. And that this body, as united with his soul, to the deity; in the glorious person of Immanuel, is the eternal life: Hence whoso eateth him, shall live by him.

To eat and to drink his flesh and blood, certainly intends such an apprehension of our union and oneness with Christ; as inspires us with wisdom, resolution, and power to appropriate him. So to mingle with his flesh and blood; *i. e.* his human nature; that all his labours, sufferings, victories, and triumphs, being ours as they are his; we might eat his flesh, and drink his blood: that is derive life, purity, confidence, and bliss; from our being one flesh and blood with him; intitling us to his peace and joy, which is unspeakable, and full of glory.

What a person eats and drinks, being properly digested in the stomach; the nutritive part, after chylication, becomes blood; and mingles with the whole mass: adding health, strength, and magnitude to the body through-
out.

out. Thus, what a person eats and drinks, becomes one with himself : and except it does so, the person is not nourished, nor can he live thereby.

In like manner, to eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of man ; is to apprehend our union with him, our membership in his body, even of his flesh and of his bones : in such sort, that becoming one with his flesh and blood, we rejoice together with him ; in all the benefits of his humiliation, and exaltation in the body. And thus, that *Christ* who hath a body of flesh and bones, is our eternal life.

As *Coppin* tauntingly asks, how a personal *Christ* can be said to be in us, as our eternal life ? I answer, Christ, in the scriptures, is said to be our eternal life, in a two-fold sense ; first, as he hath taken upon him the seed of *Abraham*, personating, and wearing the people in the body of his flesh : he was born in them, circumcised in them, baptized in them, tempted in them, fulfilled all righteousness in them ; he suffered in them, died in them, rose again in them, ascended in them, and liveth forever in them. Thus saith the prophet : *Lord, thou wilt ordain peace for us : for thou also hast wrought all our works in us.* And thus is *Christ* in us, the hope of glory. Thus did *Job* behold God in his flesh. Thus all the promises, relative to God's dwelling in the people, to his coming in the flesh, &c. are fulfilled in him. In *Christ Jesus*, all the promises are yea and amen. Here we understand, how the personal *Christ* is in us, and is our eternal life, and hope of glory. The life which he lives, in his own person, he lives *in us*, and *for us* :

us: Hence the apostle tells us, that the eternal life which God hath given us, is in his Son. And our Saviour says, *Because I live, you shall live also.*

Again, *Christ* is said to be in man by faith, by revelation, by manifestation, by his spirit, &c. In this sense, he is in us, according to our individual persons. Faith is the evidence of things unseen, &c. Therefore it is that witness; *in*, and *with* power, light, and love to our minds; of the glorious person, and salvation of *Christ*: Though we have not seen him, neither are we permitted to determine of him by what we feel, or know from ourselves; yet our understandings are enlightened to discern him, according to truth: our wills consent to his salvation, and submit to his glory: our affections rejoice in him: our conscience hath peace, purity, and perfection in him.

The *Christ*, thus explained to our judgment, thus glorious before the eyes of our mind, thus borne witness of in our hearts, by the Spirit of truth; is not some creature of fancy, or the offspring of enthusiasm: but a personal *Christ*; that very *Jesus* whom the apostles preached; that identical person who died upon the cross, without the gates of *Jerusalem*: who rose from the dead, who ascended up on high, and who liveth forever. This person, according to his personal properties, glory, grace, and salvation; being explained, revealed, and witnessed of, in, and unto our faculties, is *Christ*, dwelling in our hearts by faith: There, realized (though unseen) in his person, and benefits: dwelling there, as the object of our peace and purity.

Coppin

Coppin cannot conceive how a personal *Christ* can be said to dwell in our hearts, no more than the *Jews* could conceive, how he could give them his flesh to eat : but this is certainly owing to his ignorance, both of the scriptures, and of the power of God : Where he has not a mind to believe any thing, he exercises his reasonings, asking, how can a personal *Christ* be in us ? He might as well have asked, how can the body, when dead, and mouldered to dust, ever rise again ? how could the body of *Christ* ascend in air ; without steps, or some other convenience to go up by, &c. &c. ? For these are matters which he positively denies, because he cannot comprehend them : But with regard to his own system, he is as far above all *reason* in his propositions, as the heavens are above the earth : he is there, all inspiration, and infallibility : trampling the weak and beggarly elements of reason, and common sense, under his feet.

I hope, I have sufficiently proved, that our Saviour hath a material body ; a body of flesh and bones ; and have also shewn, how he, as having such a body, may be said to be in us, as our eternal life. I would here observe of *Coppin*, and his admirers, that *their* *Christ* is *no body* : They will neither allow him to have a human body ; nor to be a person. Consequently, he is neither God nor man : nor is he a spirit of any kind ; otherwise he must be personal. *Christ*, is by them, supposed to be a principle, or quality of good : originally implanted in every creature. This supposed good, he calls the *Jacob*, which is loved of God : the least precious ; the believer ; the *Christ*, &c. And

And the evil principle, or quality in man, he calls the *Esau*, which God hates; the reprobate, the unbeliever, the antichrist, &c.

If you compare the above, with the doctrines of the *Manichees*; you will soon perceive that *Coppin's* sentiments, are only a revival of the *Manicheean* heresy. They held that there were two principles; the one of good, from which proceeded the good soul of man; and the other of evil, from which proceeded the bad soul, with the body; and all other corporeal, and perishable creatures. They, also held that the good soul, went to God, unto whom it was rejoined. They denied the resurrection of the body. They denied that *Christ* had a real body.—Whether *Coppin* gleaned his sentiments in the *Manicheean* field, or whether they were sown in him by the same hand which first sowed them in *Manes*, the leader of the sect; I shall not determine: But manifest it is, that they are perfectly similar; and that they raise the same inferences from them.

Hence it is, that in No. 2. page 45. he says “Man is become one with God, in all that “God was above man.”—I hope I shall be able to cloath my ideas, properly; and if I am, I doubt not but to detect, and expose, the fallacy, and danger, of this blasphemous proposition. He pretends that this proposition follows of consequence, from man's reconciliation in *Christ*, to the Father: and thus denies the personality, pre-eminence, and medium of *Christ*. Excuse me, if I subjoin part of a letter, which I wrote to a person in the country, not long since, on a similar subject.

“ I

ad “ I cannot but greatly dislike that proposition in your letter, *of our being equal with God*. It is said of our Saviour, indeed; that *he thought it no robbery to be equal with God*. This was intended as a proof of his real godhead: since in a strict sense of the word, God has no equal. Whatever equality, our Saviour as a man, has to God; it is according to that grace, and favour only, which the deity hath conferred upon the human nature in his person. Hence he is called the man, God’s fellow. That is, his companion, his friend, whom he hath exalted at his own right hand, to be a prince, and a Saviour: And unto whom he is so closely, mysteriously, and eternally united; that the Lord *Jesus*, according to the properties of his human nature, stands invested by the godhead, with all divine perfections: so that it was no robbery for *him* to think himself equal with God. But it does not follow from thence, that *we* are equal with God: It is manifest robbery, for *us* to think in such a manner: we rob the scriptures of their truth; for they declare the contrary: We rob that God of his honour; who says, my glory I will not give to another: We rob our Lord *Jesus Christ* of his pre-eminence, and are schismatics in the first sense of the word. It is, as if the foot should say, I am the head; therefore put the crown upon me; or at least, let me have a crown, as well as the head. If we claim a right to say, that we are equal with God; because *Christ* is equal with him: Is it not as if the foot should say, I must needs be the seat of wisdom to the body; because the head is such? Or, I must needs have

have the pre-eminence and crown, because the head hath them? do not you perceive how groundless, and false, all such inferences are?

To infer that we are equal with God; because *Christ* thought it no robbery to be equal with God; is either to deny, that *Christ* is any other person than the church, and, that the scriptures have any other meaning than the people; in what they speak of him: Or, if we confess him to be an individual, a distinct person, wholly independent of mankind, in point of existence: I say, if we thus confess him, and yet insist on our being equal with God; because he is so: we certainly rob him of his pre-eminence, and deny him as the mediator between God and man. To say, that *Christ* hath none other body, or person, than the people; is the same in argument, as if we said, the head hath none other reality of existence, than what it hath in the hand, or in the foot.

The Lord *Jesus*, in his person, and in the mystery of his body, may be considered as simple, and aggregate. Simple, as he stands alone, in an uncompounded existence; where he is not the people, neither are the people him. In this point of view, he stands high above every creature in heaven, on earth, and under the earth; he is *there* fairer than the sons of men, and the perpetual object of their worship.

But in his office-capacity, as he represented, and personated mankind; which he did in his birth, obedience, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension; and now doth in his everlasting life; he was the aggregate. He was in all *this*, the sum total of mankind; who were thus gathered

D

into

into one body. But the aggregate, was subject to the simple. Hence it is, that the people, who are purified, and exalted in the aggregate; pay eternal homage to the simple; falling before his feet, and forever singing, Worthy is the Lamb, &c. And whilst they acknowledge him to be the Lord, to be the only holy, they confess that the simple is the head of the aggregate.

The apostle tells us, that the head of every man is *Christ*, and the head of *Christ* is God. From this, you may perceive, that we have no immediate *union* with God; much less an equality with him.

It is *Christ* only, in his simple existence; who is united to God: he only, is one with the Father: In him, the deity is immediate head to the human nature: which branch of human nature, in the man *Christ Jesus*, is immediately head over all things, to the aggregate; *i. e.* to his body the church.

By *Christ*, as the medium between God, and man; every good, and perfect gift cometh. He is the immediate receiver of all good, from God. He is the exalted, he is the anointed, he is the crowned King of kings, and Lord of lords: whilst we, without envy, without repining, rejoice in his glory; and are joyfully subject to him.

Should it be granted, that the hand, the foot, or the more uncomely parts of the body; have a right to claim an equality with the head, (which is not an unexceptionable rule) yet this right, in every member, must be limited to its own head. With what propriety then

then can we claim an equality with God, who is the head of *Christ*, and not our immediate head?

We certainly can claim no more, than to be as our own head; nor is that claim ascertained any farther, than as he is considered the aggregate: for in his simple, and individual existence, he is anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows. He is *there* the object of our worship, love, praise, delight, and eternal admiration.

From all which, I conclude, that the proposition of our being equal with God, is meer rant; and more than bordering upon blasphemy. It is productive of many hurtful and pernicious errors: it inspires mankind with luciferian pride; though in comparison of the Almighty, they are lighter than vanity, they are less than nothing. It dishonours our Creator, by making him such a one as ourselves. It destroys the medium between God and man; which is *Christ Jesus* the Lord. It denies the *pre-eminence* of our Saviour, as head over all things to his body the church.

But as Mr. *Richard Coppin*, in his writings, does not gather with *Christ*; as he denies the body, and person of the Lord *Jesus*: it will be objected probably, that my arguments do not comprehend the grounds of his proposition. I believe I am as well aware of his meaning, as his admirers are; excepting none of them. But I confess, there is some difficulty, in framing arguments against things which will *scarcely* bear any: as is the case here. He says that "Man is become one with God, in all that God was above

“man.” But it is neither true in divinity, nor philosophy. Is man become one with God in his eternity, wisdom, power, purity, &c. &c.? the proposition is odious, and blasphemous.

Had he said of *Christ*, according to the properties of his *human nature*; that he is become one with God, in all that God was above him; he had erred against the truth. But, as he denies the person of *Christ*; he must by *man*, whom he says is one with God, mean the creature, himself, his brethren, &c. And does it appear, either to men, or angels; that man, a worm, subject to passions, and compassed about with infirmities, is one with God; in all the tremendous height of his glory and majesty? Nay, as the heavens are above the earth, so are his ways, and his thoughts above ours.

Again, as he denies the personality of *Christ*—as he treats all the scripture-account of things allegorically.—as he says, that the believer, and unbeliever, are, in every man, &c. He acts consistent with himself, in making out that salvation, [which our Saviour taking upon him the seed of *Abraham* by his obedience, sufferings, death and resurrection, wrought out for us in his own person:] to consist in a work, or operation, wrought within us.

“God (saith he) reveals all his secrets
 “within, and all the works that he doth in
 “this new creation, he doth within us: And
 “therefore, let all those that desire to be
 “made partakers of this new creation, look
 “for it within them; for there will God
 “work it.” *Advancement of all things in Christ*,
 &c. pag. 24.

God,

God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake unto our fathers by the prophets, said, *Be ye glad, and rejoice in that which I create.* But if this new creation is wrought in us; it follows that we are to rejoice in ourselves. But the apostle tells us, that *Christ* is made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; that whosoever glorieth, should glory in the Lord. *Christ* says, *Look unto me all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved:* but *Coppin* says, we must look unto ourselves for it. The apostle says, *We are God's workmanship created anew in Christ Jesus, &c.* But *Coppin* says, we are created anew in ourselves. The promise, which God made, of creating all things anew; *Coppin* says he fulfills, by working it within us. But *Christ* told the apostle *John*, that this promise was fulfilled in his person; *It is done, saith he, I am the Alpha, and Omega, the beginning and the end.* The prophet speaking of mankind, (not excepting Mr. *Coppin*) says, *The best of them is as a briar, the most upright is sharper than a thorn hedge, &c. &c. therefore will I look unto the Lord, &c.* The apostle speaks of the sentence of condemnation in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in the living God.

If we try it by experience, reason, and common sense, this new creation is not discernable in man. There has no physical change passed over him; his body is the same, subject to pain, sickness, and death; and compassed about with manifold infirmities. Nor is there any inward change, answerable to a new creation: where old things are done away, and all things are

become new. Those who pretend to the highest refinements, and spirituality, are men subject to like passions with others; as is very obvious in the author himself, who could not bear the least opposition from his antagonists. Their censures, and reflections, wounded his vanity, and self-importance, in such sort that he could not contain himself; but resolving not to be behind hand with them, he gave them as good as they sent; yea, I think rather exceeded them in the article of judgment and censure. But this I suppose he thought he had a right to do, as being more spiritual than his opponents. And I have sufficient reason to conclude, that the case is still the same, with some of his admirers.

And if men are censorious, proud, vain, and selfish, with what propriety, or justice, can they look for this new creation in themselves? and wherein doth it consist? If its a truth, that they love God, it is an invisible one. But it is a truth visible enough that they love the present world; and yet the apostle saith, *If the love of the world is in any man, the love of the Father is not in him.* They may tell us that they love their brethren, but it is a matter that we are no further sure of, than as we take their bare word for it; but this, we are very sure of, that they love themselves; that being notorious enough. And yet to be lovers of their own selves, is ranked by the apostle among the reprobate characters.

In fact, where men differ nothing from others; (except in partiality to themselves) opinion, sentiment, or theory, is not sufficient to
 prove

prove them spiritual men, or that the new creation is within them.

Pray, is not this enthusiastic conceit, this vain-glorious imagination, or the good principle in man; the beast, *that was, and is not?* that it is full of the names of blasphemy, I think is plain enough: for, it arrogates the personal characters, names, works, sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension and glory; of our only Lord and God, *Jesus Christ*; usurps his crown, and throne; and exalts itself against all that is called God, and that is to be worshipped.

This is the beast that all the world worshipeth, and goeth after. Pagans, Mahometans, Jews, Christians of all denominations, and of every sect, worship this beast; going after him perpetually, in their admiration, desires, and esteem.

This beast, bears different names, according to the different languages of men: The Heathen call him virtue. The Jews, and Mahometans, call him obedience: only the one respect *Moses*, (as their prophet and legislator) and the other, *Mahomet*. Amongst Christians, this beast bears divers names, according to their various divisions; and every distinct name, by which it is called, may be considered as the shibboleth of the sect, making use of it. By some he is called grace, and the salvation of man, very cordially imputed to him; to the dishonour of the Son of God.

By others, he is called inward holiness, sanctification, imparted righteousness, inherent righteousness, &c. Whilst others, call him the inward light, the Spirit, &c: and make him infallible in reproof, instruction, and doctrine.

And again, there are others, as *Coppin, &c.* who call him *Christ*, the elect, the believer, yea, God himself.

Now I say, that the different names, and epithets, made use of amongst all these; (notwithstanding their various attachment to men and things) makes no difference at all, with respect to their object of admiration, and worship, or to their hope of salvation: for the terms, virtue, obedience, grace, holiness, light, or *Christ* as supposed to be naturally in man, are all congenial: and characteristics of the beast *that was, and is not*: And this beast is always manifest, from its being opposed to the person of *Jesus Christ* our Lord: and to that free, and gracious salvation which he has wrought out for mankind, without works of righteousness; as done by them.

As to the *origin* of this supposed good in man, its admirers are not perfectly agreed about it: there are some, such as *Coppin, &c.* who consider it as the seed of God, sown in man at his first creation; which was not totally lost, or extinguished by the fall; but buried only, as it were, under a heap of rubbish: from whence, not being quite dead, it sends forth, some weak breathings by way of conviction, repentance, desire, &c. until it hear the voice of God, and come forth out of its grave. But others reject this, as unscriptural, unwarrantable, and enthusiastic; and tell us, that this good is only to be attained by study, by industry, by observing and copying good examples, &c. Others, tell us, that it proceeds from the impressions which the belief of particular doctrines makes upon the mind,

mind. And others, that it is the free gift of God to them, without any consideration whatever. Those divers opinions, cause disputes, and bickerings, even amongst such who are otherwise perfectly agreed in patronizing the same matter.

But in the general, it is enough; to be orthodox in this particular. To profess it, to make pretensions (at least) of being possessed of it, to converse much of it, to declaim in its favour, to paint out its beauties, &c. *this*, in general, I say, is thought sufficient to denominate a man virtuous and good. But if he add to this, an appearance of care and diligence, in cultivating it; by practising some austerities, relative to meats, drinks, rest, sleep, and things of that nature; if his apparel, gesture, speech, and manner, bear any, even the least correspondence with his pretension, it is then enough *indeed*: it makes no difference, whether he believes in God, and in *Christ*, or not: and though he may have many lusts, and vices predominant in him; such as pride, incontinence, covetousness, deceitfulness, cruelty, superstition, &c. yet these, if known, are in the estimation of mankind, abundantly over-balanced by the supposed good which is in them: though the latter, in reality, can only be in *appearance*, whereas the former is *manifest*.

Upon this principle it is, that numbers among the Christians, both antient and modern, have thought it right to compliment the Heathen, such as *Socrates*, *Cicero*, *Seneca*, and others, with the favour and salvation of their God: and that not because they were human
creatures,

creatures, or the offspring of *Adam*; but because they were great men! good men! wise men! they said a great many wise and good things. Their admirers among the Christians, in order to make them speak some knowledge of the true God, and of *Christ*; stretch their sayings upon the tenter-hooks of their enthusiastic fancy, in such sort, that they break their connection, and render their fine things quite unmeaning.

Thus the relator of *Anson's* voyage, &c. tells us, how that a jesuit, (in favour of Mr. *Anson*) explained that article of the Romish church, which denies the salvation of heretics; in a lax and hypothetical sense: Wherefore? why truly, on the account of some supposed goodness in him: he did not ravish their women; nor kill and eat their men; that fell into his power: though it was not their persons, but their gold, that he was in search of: In the taking of which from them; neither his modesty, as a philosopher, nor his self-denial; as a christian, was so very conspicuous, as to encourage them to canonize him. But constitution, or accident, (befriending him in some other particulars) gained him the reputation of a faint (in those parts) it seems.

But

It is said of the grand vizior *Cuprogli*, that when dying; some of the last words that he spake, fixing his eyes upon the Alcoran, were these: "Prophet, I shall soon see whether thy words are true; but be they true or false, I am sure of being happy, if virtue be the best of all religions" He was certainly a person of much sagacity; courageous, and faithful to his master: But if this is virtue,
it

But a perfect, uniform practice, is not at all necessary to the formation of this character; to be a zealous theorist is sufficient: with some specious appearances of virtue; however irregular, or tarnished with pride, self-seeking, &c. Thus a person of this character, shall be judged to have a sure title to happiness: whether he believe in God, in *Christ*, in *Moses*, or in *Mahomet*; or indeed if he believe in neither. Diametrically opposite to truth, as resting upon reason and experience: and in the most glaring contradiction to divine revelation: it is asserted upon this principle, that every truly happy man, is wholly the son of his own actions: without being under the least obligation to the grace, mercy, and love of his God and Redeemer.

Mankind in the general, make this their fundamental, whilst matters of faith, are considered, rather as a science to be studied: or as somewhat calculated for men to employ their wits about. Thus, whatever they profess to believe; in every time of danger, their corpse of reserve is their own goodness.

I call

it is not impossible to find a virtuous dog. This man, so virtuous in his own eyes, was, to all appearance, a stranger to humanity, to the universal love of mankind, and to that self-denial, &c. which constitute true virtue. He was proud, cunning, and cruel; but assiduous in his office: and an instrument perfectly qualified to raise the pride and pomp of a tyrant, in the destruction of thousands of his fellow-creatures. And yet this is the person, who, in the article of death (when he can do no more mischief) sings a requiem to his soul, because virtue is the best of all religions.

I call this the beast, because I think, it answers to the character of that beast spoken of in the book of the Revelations, whom all the world goeth after: the character is there drawn up very brief; *i. e.* **WHICH WAS, AND IS NOT.** By which, I suppose, we may understand; that there was once, before the fall of *Adam*, some truth, in what man now vainly, and falsely pretends to. Therefore, that which *was, is not*: it hath now, none other existence in man, than what it has in pride and ignorance.

Upon this beast, rides the great whore, or the false church, composed as I have shewn, of all nations, kindreds and tongues; and of all professions.

And yet, notwithstanding there is such an admiring multitude, such a cloud of witnesses daily chaunting forth the praises of this beast: The most curious searcher, can never find out, by reason and scripture, (nor by reason alone, consistent with its ideas of the divine perfections) this boasted good, this divine stamina in man: nor can the most intelligible speaker describe it, as existing in the creature, in any degree of consistency, with what is notorious, demonstrable and certain in him.

Nay, God himself, (whose eyes are as flames of fire, and whose eyelids try the heart of the children of men) cannot find out this good in man: he says, that he *looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, that did seek God: every one of them is gone back; they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doth good, no not one,*
Pf.

Pf. liii. 2, 3. and xiv. 2, 3. God, upon examining the human heart, tells us, that every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart, is evil and that continually; and that the heart, is desperately wicked and deceitful above all things. And again, that the good man is perished out of the earth; there is none upright amongst men: the best of them is as a briar; and the most upright, is sharper than a thorn hedge. Our Saviour and his apostles, testify that this good is not in man. Our blessed Lord, though holy, harmless, undefiled, would not suffer them to give *him* the epithet of good, whilst they saw him only as man, saying, Why callest thou me good? *there is none good but one, even God.* And the apostles saith, if any man hath whereof he may glory in the flesh, I more. Yet he counts it all but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of *Christ Jesus* his Lord; yea, but dung, that he might win *Christ*, and be found in him. How vain and frivolous then, are all the pretensions of men, to this new creation, salvation, or holiness as wrought in them.

Again, Mr. *Coppin* says, with a great degree of boldness, and certainty; that all mankind shall be saved, No. i. ch. 6. Hence, I can account for the attachments of particular people, to his writings: for had he been a professed Infidel, with respect to faith in *Christ*, this very opinion, of universal salvation, would sufficiently recommend him to those who have nothing besides to comfort their minds with; which, it is to be feared, is the case with too many of such who make a point of it.

But

But in this, the author is strangely inconsistent: for his hypothesis is, that salvation, the *new creation*, &c. is wrought in the creature; and that every man is to look for it in himself. But it remains to be proved, that this new creation, this salvation, is wrought in every man: And yet, except it be thus wrought within them, they cannot be saved, according to him: But the apostle says, All men have not faith. And as the terms faith, *Christ*, salvation, &c. are synonymous with Mr. *Coppin*; either he, or the apostle, are in the wrong, if he say, that this salvation is in every man: For my own part, I shall, for some weighty reasons, always give the preference to the apostle.

Had he asserted the salvation of all mankind, upon the principle of *Christ*; through what he has done, and suffered for them in his own person; it would at least have had a more plausible, and consistent appearance: but to assert it upon the following principles, which are his: "Let all those who desire to be made partakers of this new creation, look for it within them, for there God will work it." And again, "Not to look for the rising of a fleshly body, but a spiritual body within, for the truth of all things is within." I say, to assert universal salvation upon those principles, so very repugnant to the scriptures, and to common sense, was a most unadvised conceit. If every man is to judge of his future and eternal state, by those inward and divine appearances; and not according to the love of God, manifest through the sufferings, death,
and

and resurrection of the Lord *Jesus*: there are but few, nay there are none, who will have a just and clear title to it.

But alas, we are only upon the surface as yet, we have not sounded the depths of this author.—In the first chapter of this book, intitled, *The advancement of all things in Christ*; he tells us, that he had observed amongst professors, people of opposite sentiments; the one part holding, that all mankind should be saved; and the other asserting, that a part only should be saved: Upon which Mr. *Coppin* says, “ There is a mistake in both these parties, neither of them understanding the mind of God, nor the mystery of his will, as laid down in a dead letter. *” A most surprizing declaration

* It is a very pernicious error, to call the scripture a dead letter: for our Saviour saith, *The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life*. By which words, he means, those which the evangelists penn'd from his mouth: As also those which he, in the Spirit of truth, put into the mouths of his apostles. Again, to consider the scriptures as a dead letter, is to deny them as a rule for the trial of spirits: which is to give all private spirits an opportunity to assert their being of God: however inconsistent and contrary to each other. Again, If the writings of the apostles be a dead letter: then, every man supposing himself to be led by the Spirit, is at liberty, not only to put what construction he pleases upon their doctrines; but also to correct them, and contradict them, where they do not suit him. Hence, may be easily discerned, what disorder and confusion must necessarily follow the proposition that the scriptures are a dead letter. It is not of the scriptures, that the apostle speaks where he says *the letter killeth*. Nor is it of that spirit, by which any man professes to be led, and instructed, in a manner independent of the scriptures: that he speaks, where he says *the Spirit giveth life*. It is the meer
coinage

ration indeed! neither the whole of mankind, nor a part of them are to be saved! I should have thought, that the most simple, and unbiassed mind upon earth, would have readily concluded, that the one or the other was in the right: that where there was a salvation of mankind, either the whole, or a part of them would be saved, though they might not determine

coinage of an antichristian brain to call the scriptures a dead letter: and as foreign from the design of the apostle, as light is from darkness. The apostle, by the letter understands the law of commandments contained in ordinances; which, by reason of their darkness and contrariety unto us, are a dead and killing letter. And by the Spirit, he intends the Lord Jesus, the substance, and fulness of all grace, signified by the ordinances; who having abolished them in himself, as being the end of the law, is called the Spirit which giveth life. The law consists of precepts, requisites and threatnings: and the depravity of human nature, being such; that mankind are utterly incapable of fulfilling the precept, of producing the requisite, or of enduring the punishment, they are, in point of consolation, dependance, and hope from themselves condemned and slain by the law: therefore it is called, a killing letter. The life-giving Spirit, is the gospel, or that infinite love, and dispensation of grace: where the commandment is fulfilled in Christ: where all requisites, as repentance, faith, love, &c. are produced in him, and the punishment as perfectly adequate to our offences sustained by him. This, is Spirit, as being the alone work of the Spirit, wrought in Christ; and perfectly free from the spot of human righteousness. This being the quickening Spirit, it is said to give life, because it gives the perfect salvation of Jesus, freely unto such who are dead by the law. And thus it is, that the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life. With what propriety then, can any man call the written word of God wherein those things are contained, a dead letter? or wherefore must the person who believes, what he reads in the scriptures, be accounted of as a mistaken man?

mine which, but rather have waited for the day of decision.

But as the knowledge, and enjoyments, which are yet future, with respect to such as me; were present to this author, (if you will believe him) and are so now to his disciples—he immediately determines the matter, by affirming, that neither a part, nor the whole, of mankind shall be saved. He declares that the persons of mankind are neither saved nor damned, that they are neither hated, nor loved of God: but, that it is the good and evil which is in them, that God loves, and hates, which he saves and damns.

“God, saith he, hates no man’s person, but the evil in the person: neither doth he love any man’s person, any further than as they shew forth something of himself; as they were created by him: and in this sense he loves all creatures.” I look upon this first chapter of his *Advancement of all things in Christ*, to be a compleat compendium of his whole system. All the fruit of his labours, the produce of his wisdom and knowledge, stands here delineated, and may without prejudice, or critical narrowness, be summed up, and perfectly comprehended in the following proposition.

God at first, put forth mankind, and all creatures, as an outward image, or form of himself, and sowed the seed of eternity, or planted *Christ* the good principle in them: but evil taking place in time, they had two opposite qualities, or principles in them: and these two principles, constitute the different characters, which are applied to the persons of men,

as believer, and unbeliever, &c. they also constitute the characters of *Christ*, and *Belial*, &c. After the will of God is accomplished upon them, man dies: and in the article of death, *Christ*, or the good principle, or quality, returns to God, and is absorpt in him, whilst the evil principle is destroyed in his wrath. As for the person of man, that being only erected as a stage, for those principles to combat each other upon for a season, (for whose diversion, I cannot pretend to say) it is thrown down in death, and being there annihilated, it perishes eternally as a beast.

This is a perfect anatomy of his body of divinity, not something merely deducible from his writings; but what he in sundry parts of his works, has positively affirmed for truth: This he hath cloathed with consequent propositions, such as denying the personality of *Christ*, the resurrection of the body, and the salvation of man's person.

He saith, that the person of man, is no more than a beast, and hath no pre-eminence above a beast. From hence it follows, that there is nothing lost, nor saved, but the good and evil qualities in man. As these qualities are no part of man, but are, by him, distinguished from the persons of men, it follows, that the persons of men are not at all interested in the fate of either: Nay, he says, that the persons of men, hath only the portion of a beast, to die and be no more.

As we must necessarily lose all intelligence, and consciousness of existence, in the loss of our persons, it remains to be asked, for what purpose

purpose were we created? wherefore was man distinguished from the brute, by being possessed of the powers of thinking, reasoning, reflecting, hoping, fearing, &c.? Wherefore the desire of immortality, and the perfect aversion to annihilation, which we feel within us? To what purpose did *Coppin* himself write; and what was his hope under the persecutions, which he reports to have met with in the world?

Is this, the salvation that he hath promised to all mankind? Truly they are not much obliged to him: I believe, that the generality of those who think, will not thank him for the tidings he brings to their ears, nor once bid him God speed. But such inconsistent, and horrible whims, are ever the consequence of men's forsaking their own mercies, to follow lying vanities.

And yet there are those, whose attachment, to the opinion of universal salvation, is such, that rather than part with it, they will be content, that some very minute part of them only, shall be saved: Or, with *Coppin*, that only some principle of good, in them, shall be saved, whilst their persons shall perish everlastingly: Yea, they would rather that the whole race of *Adam*, should be annihilated, than that all should not be saved.

The cause of which, is easily discovered: They are a people, whose conscience reproaches their conduct, and will not suffer them to have any hope from themselves. They are also destitute of that faith in *Christ*, which as the evidence of things unseen, and the substance of things hoped for; gives assurance of personal interest in

the salvation of Jesus.—Thus, that they might not be left as persons without hope; necessity compels them to have recourse to the opinion of universal salvation.

I do not mean that this is the case with all, who are of this opinion: there may be some, who though well persuaded of their own personal interest, in the salvation of *Christ*; are yet touched with sympathy, and compassion for their fellow-creatures: and seeing nothing in themselves better than others, perceive no reason why others should not be benefited by *Christ* as well as themselves. They may also reason from the riches of divine love, from the all-sufficiency of redemption by the blood of *Jesus*, &c. But after all, this opinion is not essential to their happiness; they do not make a point of it; nor would they in the least respect, sacrifice the glory and honour of our Saviour to it: They may desire, hope, and think, but they are not positive. It would be uncharitable, and cruel, to censure such as those, whose *hearts* seem to be right with the Lord.

It is therefore rather to the serious consideration of the former, than to the latter, that I would recommend the following objections to their darling opinion: as they consist with the scriptures, and with reason.

I will begin with a question once proposed to our Saviour upon this head: *Lord, are there few, that be saved?* Luke xiii. 24. It is certain that the person who asked the question, had drawn such conclusions from the doctrines, which he had heard *Christ* preach. Remark the Lord's answer: *Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I*
say

say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. Doth not our Saviour seem to approve of this person's ideas, and to confirm them rather, by his answer? or what are we to understand by the strait gate; through which but few comparatively enter?

Again, *But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost*, 2 Cor. iv. 3. That all men do not believe the gospel, or that it is hidden from some; is so very notorious, that it requires no proof from me. It remains for us then, only to enquire into the meaning of the term *lost*, as it is applied in the text. First, it cannot intend our being lost in *Adam*, for that would be to make the apostle say, if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them who are lost in *Adam*: But all mankind are lost in *Adam*; and yet the gospel is not hidden from all mankind: as appears from the distinction made in the text. Doth not the term *lost*, in the text, relate to the present and future misery of such, who believe not the glorious gospel of the son of God? if not, what does it then relate to?

Again, our Saviour saith, *If ye believe not that I am, ye shall die in your sins.* And again, *Whither I go, ye cannot come*, John viii. 24, 21. As it is needless for me to attempt proving, that all mankind do not believe in *Jesus*: we have only to consider the meaning of those words: *Ye shall die in your sins.* *Whither I go, ye cannot come.* What does a person's being in his sins intend? does it not imply a guilty conscience, unwashed, impure, and miserable: a conscience not believing, not apprehending the great salvation: and therefore as unhappy through ignorance, and unbelief, as if the Saviour had

not died, and risen again? Is not living and dying in this state; what is meant by dying in their sins? and if they die in their sins, wherefore should it be supposed, that their state is changed in the article of death? Is not this ascribing the glory, and honour of our Saviour, to death; which is an enemy? If a man was to die a thousand times, he will not be the happier for that. True happiness consists in beholding the glory of God, in the face of *Jesus Christ*. It is not by death, that we believe the gospel, but by faith, which is the gift of God, and which cometh by hearing. It is not death, that purifies the heart, and purgeth the conscience from dead works: but the blood of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. It is not by death, that we are changed, but it is by beholding the glory of the son of God.

Thus death, cannot in any sense, be said to be our Saviour. If death infallibly cured all ills, and rendered every soul happy that passed through it; it would be adviseable for all the miserable to fly to it with speed: as they would find in death a sure refuge from all distress*.

How

-
- * To be, or not be: that is the question;
 Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
 The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
 Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
 And by opposing end them. To die, to sleep—
 To sleep perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub;
 For in that sleep of death what dreams may come,
 When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
 Must give us pause: there's the respect
 That makes calamity of so long life.

For

How shall we understand those words: *Whither I go, ye cannot come?* do it not suppose, that there are some, who at death, cannot enter into that glorious bliss, where Jesus is gone? If this, is not the meaning of the words, I would gladly know what the true meaning is.

Again, Our Saviour saith, *Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation,* John v. 28, 29. Doth not this intend the future resurrection of the body? As to what Coppin says upon these words, I pay no attention at all to it, because it is unscriptural, and irrational. If it is objected that the grave in scripture, signifies hell. I answer, it doth not intend it here, for two reasons. First it is in the plural number; *i. e.* *graves*, which it never is, where it intends hell. Secondly, we read here of good and bad, coming out of their *graves*; which cannot be applied

For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
 Th' oppressors wrong, the proud man's contumely,
 The pangs of despis'd love, the law's delay,
 The insolence of office, and the spurns
 That patient merit of the unworthy takes,
 When he himself might his *quietus* make
 With a bare bodkin? Who would fardels bear,
 To groan and sweat under a weary life,
 But that the dread of something after death,
 (That undiscovered country, from whose bourn
 No traveller returns) puzzles the will,
 And makes us rather bear those ills we have,
 Than fly to others that we know not of?

ed to hell : because it is not supposed, that such who have done good, are in hell : and therefore cannot come forth thence.

It will be objected possibly, that the term *graves*, is figurative; and implies that darkness, and ignorance, wherein we are dead and buried by nature : and from which, we are brought forth in the person, and salvation of *Jesus*. I answer, sometimes the term *graves*, as used in the scriptures, may be understood thus : as in the 37th of *Ezekiel*, &c. But this doth not appear to be its meaning in the text before us, for two reasons. First, here are two distinct characters, raised out of their graves : they that have done good, and they who have done evil : which cannot be applied to that, which is raised in the person, and salvation of *Jesus* ; because those only were raised by him, who were dead in trespasses and sins. Secondly, It is spoken of as a future matter, *the hour is coming*, &c. whereas our salvation in him, was not future, but present as well : And respecting the purpose, execution, and manifestation thereof ; it may be said, to be that which *was*, which *is*, and which is to come. Thus speaks our Lord, ver. 25. *Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the son of God : and they that hear shall live.* There is a very manifest difference, between saying the hour is coming, and *now is* : and that of saying only, the hour is coming. The former intends the present, as well as the future ; but the latter intends the future only ; the former, by proposing, that what now *is*, is yet coming, bears witness of a divine progression ; in quickning mankind

to the knowledge of the truth : But the latter, speaking in the future tense *only*, relates wholly to the resurrection of the body.

If it should be objected, upon *Coppin's* principles, that those terms, they that have done good, and they that have done evil, do not relate to the persons of mankind : but to the principles of good and evil, which are naturally in every man ; and which are raised, the one to salvation, and the other to damnation.

I answer, it must first be proved that the evil principle was dead, and buried in man, before it can be said to be raised : And here lies a great difficulty, because there are so many witnesses to prove, that the evil principle has been always alive in them, and therefore needed no resurrection ; *when I would do good, evil is present with me.* Good and evil, being qualities only, or principles, as *Coppin* calls them ; they bear no personal characters in the scripture : But the characters mentioned in the text, are personal ; and therefore cannot intend the qualities of good, and evil. Would it be sense, to say of the principle of good, they shall arise to the resurrection of life ? or of the principle of evil, they shall arise to the resurrection of damnation ? Good and evil, as qualities, or principles in man, have none other mode of existence, than by the actions, words, thoughts, inclinations, desires, &c. of the person in whom they are : separate them from the persons, and they lose their mode of existence, and become names without meaning. Good, and evil, as applied to man, have the persons, faculties, and fruits of mankind, for their substantives ;
and

and it is easily seen, that the use, meaning, and existence of the adjective, depends upon the substantive: So do the terms, good, and evil, when applied to man, depend upon their persons and conduct.

How extravagantly silly, must it then be, to talk of raising, saving, or damning, the meet principles, or properties of good, and evil: distinct, and separate from the persons of mankind! To talk in that manner, is indeed so to fight, as one that beateth the air.

Laying aside all partiality, and prejudice, doth it not appear that the text under consideration, hath this meaning? There is a day approaching, when the Almighty *Jesus*, by the same all-powerful word, which in the beginning, spake the things which are, out of nothing, into materiality: shall call the dead to life again. That they shall all arise, respecting good, or evil; or that state of conscience wherein they died, in the same state they were in, when they laid down the body*: And that their

* I would not be misunderstood, as if I meant that the soul dies, or sleeps with the body until the resurrection. No: God forbid! as a christian I am assured from the scriptures, and as a man, I am persuaded from reason; of the contrary. But, where I say, that the dead will arise, respecting the conscience, in the same state wherein they died: I mean, that it is the blood of our Lord *Jesus Christ* (and not death) that is the fountain opened for sin, and for uncleanness. To suppose that mankind are saved in the article of death, whether they have believed on the Lord *Jesus* or not: is to make death a purgatory; through which, whoever passeth is made meet for the kingdom of God: or otherwise it supposeth, that all iniquity, and opposition to God,

their expectations will be according. Some, as conscious of salvation; arise in full expectation of a glorious immortality: whilst others, conscious only of their sins, arise in woeful expectation of damnation! I say, doth not this appear to be the simple, genuine meaning of the text? As to the characters, they that have done good, and they that have done evil; that spirit who gathers with *Christ*, can easily account for these: They who have done good, are those, who believing on the son of God, and properly apprehending him; appropriate his obedience,

is of the body; and consequently dies with it: or else, it is to imagine, that God, not only reverses his decree; but also for their sakes, inverts the order of things; by making them happy without believing on his Son: by feeding them with bread which they have not eaten, or by warming them with a garment which they have not put on: but the minors are false, as contrary to scripture and reason; and therefore the major is not true. Mankind are naturally miserable, and if they do not all feel it, it is owing to such things in life, as divert their thoughts and attentions from it: as ambition, honour, power, riches, pleasure, diversions, &c. But in death, all these are cut off from man; and he is left to miserable reflections, and feelings. This must be the case with all who die in their sins; *i. e.* without the faith, and knowledge, of their sins being done away, by the blood of *Jesus*: Their ignorance and unbelief is hell; and as such it will be felt, when there remains nothing to divert the attention from it. And as we know of no dispensation, for their delivery, between death, and the restitution of all things; therefore was it, that I said: They would rise, respecting good, or evil, or their state of conscience; in the state they were in, when they laid down their body. If it should be asked, whether it is not possible, for such who were once believers in *Jesus*; to lie down in sorrow? and whether they will remain in that state of misery wherein they died? I answer, that, which from

obedience, and sufferings: and thus by union with him, are conscious of *his* good doings; in which consciousness, they live, and die, and rise again. They who have done evil are the contrary character; they believe not, they appropriate not; they are only conscious of their own works, &c. which being all evil, they are characterized accordingly.

I might quote many other passages of scripture, as objections to the opinion of universal salvation; but as they are all of like nature with those already mentioned, I shall mention no more of them here; but shall now, offer
such

from the fears, terrors, and complaints of a dying person, may appear very dark to the survivors; may yet be cleared up to the afflicted, before they have left the body: and when they are incapable of giving standers-by, any account thereof. As in the mariner's compass, when the needle, which is touched by the loadstone; is set upon the pivot, it naturally points towards the north; nor will it stand to any other point, without a force put upon it: So the real christian, is a person whose heart the Lord hath touched, and *Christ* is the pole to which it points. If it is left to the bias which is given it by the divine contact, it will not bear to any other point: Therefore, whenever we find the heart thus touched, varying from its pole, we conclude; that it is held by some malignant power, contrary to its spiritual bias; Should this continue until death, which may be the case with some; the power which restrained the heart, is then broken; and it gladly returns to *Christ* the center of all its joys. Thus, though the enemy may for a time, make the christian heart vary from its pole; by working upon their bodily infirmities: such as nervous disorders, melancholy, lunacy, phrensy, idiotism, deliriums in fevers, &c. Yet death frees the soul from all these; and administers an entrance for it into the fulness of that bliss, which, at any time it had tasted, in the knowledge of the son of God. This, is the difference in death, between the christian, and the infidel.

such objections, as reason and common sense suggests, to this opinion. Doth not the opinion of universal salvation, suppose; that the irreligious, and unbelieving part of mankind; hath greatly the advantage of others? The Psalmist saith of the former, *They are not in trouble as other men: neither are they plagued like other men.* If all, who die, go immediately to glory; then the state of that person, who passeth through life, without thought, without conviction, without fear, without temptation, without reproach, without persecution, &c. which is the state of an unthinking infidel, of the man of pleasure, the worshipper of the God of this world: I say, the state of such a person, must be vastly preferable, to that of the religious man, *i. e.* of the true believer. The apostle saith of the latter, *We were troubled on every side: without fightings; within fears.* They are troubled with the plague of a corrupt heart; (of which others are not convinced) they are troubled with the temptations of *Satan*; (whereas in others, the strong man armed keeping his palace, all his goods are in peace) they are troubled from without; hated, despised, and persecuted in life. But, if unbelievers, and despisers, are equally advantaged with them in death; then instead of gaining by the faith of the son of God, we suffer loss: which God forbid!

This argument, will be answered, with saying: That where troubles abound, as in the true christian, consolations much more abound; and that the happiness, which a believer feels, through the faith of the son of God, much more

more than compensates for all the afflictions, which he has sustained more than other men. That there are unspeakable consolations in the knowledge of the son of God, I readily confess : and, that there is something in the religion of *Jesus*, so delightful, and satisfactory to the mind, that such who know it, cannot chuse but think, and say, that if there was nothing farther than the grave, it is preferable to all that this world can afford. But this is not always the case ; let it be remembered here, that the religion of *Jesus* proposes a future state ; and such a state is believed, by those who make their confession as above. Besides, every christian hath not equal consolations : There are some, who are children of affliction all their days ; subject to bondage, and to the fear of death ; and are yet dependant on *Jesus*, under a particular dispensation. Again, the generality of those who talk much of their happiness, are but proud boasters ; they have taken up christianity, as a system ; they know nothing of themselves, and, not having *Christ* revealed in them, by the Spirit, there is no opposition from the enemy : they are not plagued as other men ; but being of chearful, joyous dispositions, they think themselves perfectly assured, of matters which they know nothing at all of. Such as these cannot say with the apostle, *If we had only hope in this life, we should be of all men most miserable.* Neither the prophets, nor apostles, ever proposed, that the enjoyments which we have, of divine matters, over balances the distresses, which every real christian meets with in life ; but quite the reverse. Hence it is, that we are directed

directed to that, far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, which remains for us; in comparison of which, our present afflictions indeed are but light; but they would be heavy enough, if we had no *future* expectations.

Again, if according, to the opinion of universal salvation; all mankind went immediately through death, to glory: the scriptures are of no use, they have been continued unto us, to no purpose; and the preaching of the gospel is vain. If all are equally saved, unto what purpose do we read, and study the scriptures; beseeching our Saviour, to give us a true understanding of them? possibly it will be answered, they might as well be let alone; every man might spare himself the pains of reading and studying them; since when they come to die, they would be equally as well off as *Paul*, or *Peter*, or any other of the apostles who wrote them.—Is not this a true state of the case, if the abovementioned opinion be true. But least any one, should, through the stupor of this opinion, neglect the great salvation; and find themselves most miserably deceived when they come to die. Let us treat the matter seriously, as being of some importance.

We must acknowledge, that, through a series of divine providence, the holy scriptures have been continued to us even to this day: And that, though they have passed through the hands, not only of such, who believe not the true gospel, but even through the hands of such who are enemies to christianity in general; yet they have not been lost. This is the Lord's doing, and its marvelous in our eyes. Our
Saviour

Saviour bids us search them, for they testify of him. But to what purpose were they continued unto us, and wherefore did the Lord bid us study them; if they were not designed to be our guide, and directory, and to make us wise unto salvation? But, if all, are saved at death, the scriptures are of no use; and our Saviour's advice to read them, to search them, is altogether unimportant.

Again, if the opinion of every man's entering into glory when they die, be true; would it not be truly politic, to imbibe the popular sentiment, though it should be with the denial of Christ? By that means we should avoid, the censure, calumny, reproach, hatred, and condemnation of the world; which otherwise falls upon us, for our sentiments, and manners. From what such who call themselves christians, have imbibed from heathen philosophers; I may expect this objection. A christian, without having any view to future matters, loves truth, and makes choice of it for its own sake; when at the same time he knows he should be altogether as happy after death, if he despised it, and poured the utmost contempt upon it. To this argument, there are two very material objections. The one from the nature of man, and the other from the nature of God. First, I think the compliment a great deal too high, which is paid to human nature: in making it capable of loving virtue for its own sake. (Excepting that man who laid down his life for his enemies) I may challenge proof, that any one individual of *Adam's* race, in any one action of life, were perfectly detached from self. The
apostle

apostle tells us, that *Moses*, when he forsook *Pharaoh's* court, to suffer affliction with the people of God; had *respect unto the recompence of the reward*. There is not one action of our lives, however disinterested, and generous it may seem; but what we promise some advantage, some consolation or pleasure to ourselves by it. Hence I affirm, that the profession, of loving truth, or virtue, meerly for its own sake, is theory, only; altogether without practice.

Again, should it be granted, that mankind may act from their love to truth; for its own sake: as this would be obedience in the superlative degree; shall we not suppose that the divine Being, holy, righteous, and equitable as he is, would distinguish such a spirit; and in some sense manifest his approbation of it? But this is not done in life, according to the testimony of experience, and of the scriptures: Since the same events happen to the one, as to the other; and if all are equally happy when they die, it is not done then: which would be to suppose that good, and evil, are alike to God. A proposition, blasphemous in itself, and highly dishonourable to the divine Being.

Again, if this opinion be true, wherefore did our Saviour send forth his disciples, into all the world, to preach the gospel to every creature? and wherefore did the apostles, martyrs, and confessors of *Jesus*, suffer the most cruel torments, and even *death* for his name sake? If all, were to be equally happy in death, the apostles certainly preached in vain: for mankind had all been saved, had they been silent.

It had been more genuine mercy, not to have disturbed the world, with the animosities, and bloody persecutions, which took place upon preaching the gospel; nor to have distressed individuals, by interrupting their peace, and repose, with convictions, and manifold troubles. Wherefore did the apostles, under innumerable hardships, labour incessantly, to bring souls to the knowledge of the truth, since if they had left them alone, they had been equally happy?

If the latter be the case, the apostles, confessors, and martyrs of *Jesus*; were guilty of the most egregious folly, in subjecting themselves to such hardships as they did; in giving their bodies to be stoned, to be beheaded, burned, crucified, &c. for a testimony, the belief of which, gave them no advantage above any one of the human race: A testimony, which, if they had recanted, and denied, it could not have prevented their happiness.

Again, it makes void, and totally destroys all divine retaliations*. With what reason, or from

* It may not be unnecessary to distinguish here, between grace; and providence: according to the former, God having concluded all under sin; the free gift is upon all men, unto justification of life. But even here, a man cannot fill his belly with the east wind: he cannot have any personal happiness, until believing in the son of God, he knows his personal interest in the great salvation. When this is apprehended, whether the person was a bloody persecutor, a rapacious publican, an avowed enemy of God, of Christ; of mankind, &c. before; or not: it makes no difference, because, it is seen here, that all manner of sin and blasphemy is forgiven unto men. He who owes but fifty pence, is not more

from what revelation, can we suppose, that the mocking infidel, the bloody persecutor, the barbarous, the cruel, the avowed enemy of God, of *Christ*, and of mankind, shall when they die, though they die in the same state wherein they lived; be equally happy with *Paul*, *Peter*, *John*, &c. ? I would ask the christian, can any man be happy by *Jesus Christ*, without believing on him ? And let me also ask the Infidel, can any man be happy on the principles of human goodness, without being possessed of that goodness ? Thou forgavest them

more frankly forgiven, than him who owed five hundred pence. *Paul* speaking of himself, says—who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; but I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly in unbelief, 1 *Tim.* i. 13. The mercy which he obtained, exempted him from guilt, and condemnation; but not from the retaliations of providence: for he, who with a merciless and unrelenting eye had beheld the torments of his fellow-creatures; and had even been an abettor, and assistant, in stoning the martyr *Stephen*: was stoned himself at *Lystra*, and drawn out of the city for dead—He who had pursued the disciples of *Jesus* with the fury of the destroyer, even unto cities remote from *Jerusalem*; was pursued, himself; by the *Jewish* nation, in the elders of the people, in *Ananias* the high-priest, and in *Tertullus* the orator, even unto *Cesarea*: where they accused him before *Felix*, as a blasphemer, &c. a man worthy of death. He, who was used to make havock of the church, haling men, and women to prison: was in process of time, upon the very same principles, cast into prison himself. When *David* sinned heinously against the laws of society; in defiling the wife of a faithful servant; and then, to cover his shame, murdering the innocent worthy husband; by the hand of the children of *Ammon*: even then the prophet pronounced his iniquity forgiven: but gave him to understand that the sword should not depart from his house; which probably occasioned this saying; Thou wast a God that forgavest them, though thou tookest vengeance of their inventions, *Ps.* xcix. 8. Nor

them (saith the Psalmist) but thou tookest vengeance on their inventions. But we do not always see those characters retaliated in this life; on the contrary, they flourish as a green bay tree: but it is unreasonable to suppose, that when they die, they shall be equally happy with *Noah*, *Daniel*, and *Job*.

Again, hath not this opinion a bad effect upon the minds of mankind? doth it not make them loose, frothy, and careless? doth it not teach them to laugh at seriousness, to despise, and make a jest of divine matters? do they not
from

was it long before *Tamar* the daughter of *David*, was deflowered by her brother *Amnon*—and when this grief began a little to subside; behold *Amnon* is murdered by *Absalom*, and the murderer becomes an exile. When time had in a measure erased the memory of this evil, and partly asswaged the grief of the king; lo *Absalom* was permitted to return. Soon after he raised a rebellion against his father; chased him from his royal palace, and from his beloved capital; and then entering into his father's house, he spread a tent upon the top thereof, and lay with his wives before all *Israel*: Nor, did *David's* troubles cease, when *Absalom* was dead. From these, and many more instances which I might mention from the scriptures; we may observe that there is a distinction to be made between grace, and providence. The former pardons all, as sin against God; but the latter, one time or other, retaliates respecting our behaviour towards our brethren, or fellow-creatures. And if faith in Christ, the knowledge of the forgiveness of sins, doth not exempt persons from such a retaliation; as appears from *David*, *Paul*, &c. what must be the end of such who believe not the gospel, but are rather enemies to it all their days? We do not see that they always meet with retaliations in this life. The psalmist says, that they are not plagued as other men: but to suppose, that those who live, and die in such a state, shall enter into glory, without meeting any retaliation at all, is to impeach divine justice and equity, and to make God a respecter of persons; which God forbid, that any man should think.

from hence, neglect the scriptures; and preferring their own opinions, despise the gospel of our Lord *Jesus Christ*? In brief, do they not by means of this opinion, lose what they had attained unto; and sink into infidelity, or what is as bad, dwindle into an unthinking, stupid, careless state: and all from the opinion of universal salvation? Doth it not encourage the use of unlawful means, as suicide, &c. to escape present trouble; by entering into that bliss, unto which it pretends to entitle all mankind?

Again, it destroys the nature, properties, and use of faith: by deriving all hope, and certainty of future bliss, from false reasoning.—Having first laid down this proposition, All mankind shall be saved: what follows, but this conclusion; if every man is saved, I shall be saved? But the major is not proved; therefore the hope, and comfort, which is drawn from the minor, is precarious, and unsatisfactory. But faith is of a divine original, it is not something acquired; it is the gift of God: it consists of light, persuasion, and power: its properties are to make manifest, to persuade, and to evidence the truth of unseen things; to repel opposition; to lean, trust, hope, and depend on manifested truth; and to assure the mind of future bliss, from the veracity of the divine record. As light, it manifests *Jesus Christ* in the heart; according to the scripture report of him as our Redeemer and Saviour: it persuades us of the truth, of what we discover, it repels our fears, and false reasonings, and gives us joy and peace in believing. This is not of our-

2 selves, but of the free gift and operation of God our Saviour.

But to conclude, that we shall be saved, upon the supposition that all shall be saved; hath no faith at all in it: but it is a low reasoning, a reasoning from very great uncertainties; from an opinion that hath no foundation in revelation. Therefore I said, it made void faith; which indeed it does, and also the preaching of the gospel; and the hearing of the word, by which faith comes; as I have already shewn.

These are a few of the many objections, occurring to my mind; against the opinion of universal salvation. And these, I submit to the serious consideration of those, who are attached to that opinion.

I think I have now done with *Coppin's* works; except a few remarks, which I shall make upon the preface, to his book intitled, *The advancement of all things in Christ, &c.*

Mr. *Cayley*, the author of this preface, in order to recommend the book, more effectually, tells us, that it was written above an hundred years ago. Pray what dependance hath truth upon antiquity, or wherein consists the necessary connection? Is it necessary to our happiness that we should be antiquarians in divinity; or was that book written in an *ÆR A* of time, when men were infallible? Mr. *Cayley* pretends, that the design of his writing the preface, (was for the sake of weak brethren) to remove their prejudices, &c. And here I cannot but observe; that he must have a high opinion of himself, even beyond all rules of proportion; to suppose, that his very name would frighten the

the adversary, and remove the prejudices of the weak brethren : besides which, we have nothing but his bare word, for the glorious truth contained in this book. Mr. *Cayley* tells the reader, that, if he is a father in *Christ*, the unction of God, in him, will witness to the truth, without any other argument. What a prodigious thing, self-importance is ! We are fathers in *Christ*, if we think as Mr. *Cayley* does ; if we rejoice with him, to see so glorious a testimony ; if the unction within us witness to the truth of it, without any other argument. I would gladly know, whether the unction in Mr. *Cayley* witnessed to the truth of it, without his reading it ; for, needing not his confession, I am well persuaded, that he did not attend to any argument, neither from reason, nor scripture, when he set about recommending it.

Either Mr. *Cayley* perused this book before he prefaced it, or he did not : If he did read it, he either understood it, or he did not understand it : If he did not understand it, with what face of honesty could he recommend it ? If he did understand it, and recommend it, he must be supposed to be of the same principles with those which I have exposed ; and I hope confuted. But if he recommended it with so much warmth, without reading and considering it, which I almost suspect, from his pretending, that fathers in *Christ* (of which he is no small one in his own conceit) know the truth of books, without attending to argument. I say, if he did this, I cannot but consider him as an enthusiast, if not something worse.

But what if we cannot palate, cannot digest this precious morsel? Why then according to Mr. Cayley, we are babes, meer little-ones, who as yet feed on milk, and know not how to digest strong meat; not having as yet, our spiritual senses exercised, to discern between the mystery of good and evil. The apostle saith, *Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil.* Was I called upon to give my opinion of the novice character, I would do it thus: A novice, is a person of but small experience in the knowledge of God, or of himself. Hence he arrogates characters, and authorities, disallowed of by God and man: he expects that you should implicitly receive his sayings, or what he recommends for truth: he would persuade mankind, that he is possessed of an unerring unction: by which, without attending to argument, or making any use thereof, he knows, writes, and speaks the truth infallibly. Hence it follows, that whoso receives not his sayings, are absolutely babes, have no knowledge of spiritual things, &c. I need not say that this is a being lifted up with pride; and with such pride, as is very nearly related to the devil's pride; a spiritual pride, productive of opposition, to the person of the son of God. Mr. Cayley charges the babes, the little-ones, to beware of judging, or censuring what they understand not; which by the way, is to tell them that do not approve of it, that the fault lies altogether in *their* understanding, for that the book is faultless. As to his cautions, advice, &c. I think them sufficiently impertinent, as applied to the reading

ing of human compositions; for I know of no faith, or credit, which we owe them; any farther than they consist with the word of truth; and with the argument of reason: and where the latter is not the case, we are at liberty to reject them as error, or nonsense, whoever the writer be. He charges us, to be so reasonable, as to embrace what we can comprehend; and what is out of our reach, to leave it to God, and judge it not: perhaps what is dark to-day, may be light to-morrow. What a person is convinced of, comprehends, and believes to be true, that he naturally embraces: advice upon this head, is therefore needless. As to our not judging what is out of our reach, but leaving it to God; I would observe, that what is out of the reach, of our experience, may not be out of the reach of our understanding: therefore we are at liberty to judge of the truth of a proposition, from its rationality, consistency, &c. without having recourse to our experience; *i. e.* to such operations and effects, produced in our minds, as are perfectly correspondent with such a proposition. Every reasonable man, has a right to judge of the truth of what he reads, in the former sense, though he may be a stranger to the latter. Therefore, though what Mr. *Coppin* and Mr. *Cayley* says, may be out of our reach; respecting the experience of it; it cannot be out of the reach of any reasonable man; respecting its rationality, consistency, and consonancy with scripture; according to these he hath a right to judge of it.

As to his saying, what is dark to-day, may be light to-morrow; I see not how it relates to
truth

truth and error, for they are always the same. *Jesus Christ* is not yea and nay; he is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever: but that which opposeth him, is darkness to-day, and to-morrow also. Beware, saith he, of pinning thy faith on any man's sleeve; (a poor unmeaning saying!) Learn to see the Sun of righteousness (saith he) with thine own eyes, and not through another man's spectacles, which may deceive thee. A saying of the same nature with the former, but intended as a caution to us, against thinking; or seeing things in a different light from Mr. Cayley.

I would desire thee, O reader! (saith he) to take notice, that the spirit, which breathes in the following treatise, is nothing but *glory to God on high, and on earth, peace and good will towards men*: which is the true mark of a gospel-spirit.

I must confess, that I had once a better opinion of Mr. Cayley's judgment. I could not have thought, that he would with so much confident warmth, have recommended a book so very repugnant to the scriptures: and even to common sense. But there is one thing to be said indeed on his behalf: that he does not attend to argument; or to what the book says, so much, as he does to the breathings of the spirit in it. But whether the book, or the spirit that breathes in it, has deserved the character given it by Mr. Cayley, I have already shewn in the course of my remarks upon it. If denying the body of *Christ*, the person of *Christ*, the resurrection, and ascension of *Christ*, the salvation of *Christ*; the resurrection of *our* bodies, the salvation of *our* persons. I say, if these glorify God in the highest,

Ec.

&c. then Mr. Coppin has done it; and Mr. Cayley is not a false witness; otherwise, the contrary is manifest. But whether these doctrines, and this spirit, breathes glory to God on high, peace upon earth, and good-will towards men; or not, judge all ye people. Here (saith he) is no encouragement to sin, but great encouragement to sinners, *to behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world.* In short, in this book, (saith he) there is contained a *feast of fat things*, furnished with what is suitable both to men and babes. Is it possible, that Mr. Cayley should be so greatly charmed; and that he should have such a prodigious relish for things which he did not understand: Nay, let us rather in a judgment of charity suppose, that he did perfectly understand it; and that when he read it, he not only found it to be savoury, but to be the most delicious food to his soul. Such a supposition, and none but such, will excuse that fervent zeal, with which he recommends it. Let us also imagine, that it is from hence, he declares, that there is no encouragement to sin in it.

What encouragement it may be to sin, in telling a man that his body shall not rise again, that God neither hates, nor loves his person; that his person is neither the object of salvation, nor damnation; that every man hath in him, the principles of good and evil; and that the good principle shall be saved, and the evil one lost: I say, what encouragement these may be to sin, I shall leave to others to determine. But I am very well assured, that there is no encouragement given to sinners: to look to the
 Lamb

Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, as he insinuates ; because first, in denying the personality of the Lamb of God, and that salvation from sin, which is by his sacrifice upon the cross ; he *destroys* him, and sets up in his stead, a creature of his own fancy ; a meer calf, gilded with the supposition of a good principle in man. Mr. *Cayley* will call this the Lamb of God, if he pleases, but it is not the person whom *John the Baptist*, called the Lamb of God, that is certain : nor does looking to the Lamb of God, in Mr. *Cayley's* sense, intend any thing more, than a man's looking to himself. But here, again, I am almost tempted to think, that he does not perfectly understand the system which he has adopted ; for according to *Coppin*, man is no more a sinner than the beast that perishes. The person of man, is neither good nor evil ; but only a theatre, a temporary convenience, whereon those jarring elements, those opposite principles, and powers, make war upon each other for a season ; the person of man, being quite neutral, hath nothing to do in the affair.

Oh reader (saith he) do not fall out at table, and turn this feast into a battle, by rash judgments, and censurings, of what thou cannot yet understand.

I sincerely ask my friend *Cayley's* pardon, if I appear as one, who falls out at table. It is because he hath invited me to a feast where there is nothing to eat : but what I (supposing myself possibly, as good a judge as himself) know to be unpalatable, and unwholesome : and this, to a person of appetite, is no small disap-

disappointment. I am not quarelling, but giving my reasons only, why I cannot partake of his feast; which I take to be a point of good manners, where I am with so much earnestness pressed to eat.

Possibly, the title page of the book, which Mr. Cayley prefaced, was not a small inducement to his doing it; where we are told that the book contains *some sparkles of that glory, and some beams of that light, which shines and dwells in Richard Coppin*. What an enthusiastic, and antichristian puff, this is! O Paul! you were but a babe, when compared with these apostles. I do not remember to have read any such language in your writings, as this: being some sparkles, of that glory, and some beams of that light, that shines and dwells in me Paul. Nay, but you taught, and yet teaches, that all the sparkles of glory, and beams of light, shines and dwells in *Jesus Christ*: who is the sun of righteousness, the bright, and the morning-star.

Thine, O great apostle, was the spirit of truth: Thou bearest not witness of thyself; though if any man had whereof he might glory in the flesh, thou hadst more: But thou glorifiedst *Jesus*, by receiving of the things which were his, and shewing them unto us: It was thy business to espouse mankind to one husband, as a chaste virgin to *Christ*.

But not so Mr. Coppin, who talks of sparkles of glory, and beams of light shining and dwelling in himself; he bears witness of himself, and his witness is not true.

If Mr. Cayley, or any of *Coppin's* admirers, think that I have misrepresented them, let them not only impute it to my ignorance, but let them convince me of it. It lies particularly upon Mr. Cayley to do it; by giving us a proper comment upon *Coppin*; and in so doing, he will act up to his own memento, at the close of his preface; nor has he any just reason, to think of me otherwise, than as his sincere friend, and well-wisher.

F I N I S



